UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 00055959 1

1841
R
Cowley
Powles

THE

MISCELLANEOUS PROSE WORKS

OF

SIR WALTER SCOTT, BART.

VOL. VII.

PROVINCIAL ANTIQUITIES.

PROVINCIAL ANTIQUITIES

OF

SCOTLAND.

BY

SIR WALTER SCOTT, BART.

5HHH6
22/7/02

ROBERT CADELL, EDINBURGH;

HOULSTON AND STONEMAN, LONDON.

1843.

PR
5301
E34
v.7

EDINBURGH: PRINTED BY MACPHERSON & SYME,
31 EAST ROSE LANE.

CONTENTS

OF VOLUME SEVENTH.

PAGE

Essay on Border Antiquities..... 1
Appendix. No. I..... 142
——— No. II..... 144
——— No. III..... 148
Provincial Antiquities of Scotland.
Crichton Castle..... 157
Borthwick Castle..... 196
The Great Hall of Borthwick Castle..... 214
Town of Dalkeith..... 216
Edinburgh, General Account of..... 226
——— High Street of..... 243
——— from Braid Hills..... 247
——— Castle, from the Grassmarket..... 257
——— Heriot's Hospital, from the West Bow..... 261
——— from the Glasgow Road..... 272
——— from Corstorphine Hill..... 275
——— from the Calton-Hill..... 276
——— Entrance to Leith Harbour..... 280
——— Holyrood House..... 283
——— from Saint Anthony's Chapel..... 296
Regalia of Scotland..... 298
Appendix. No. I..... 349
——— No. II., III..... 350
——— No. IV..... 354
——— No. V..... 355
——— No. VI..... 356

PAGE

Merchiston Tower 358
Craigmillar Castle 363
Roslin Glen, and Hawthornden 366
Palace of Linlithgow 382
Seton Chapel 397
Dirleton Castle 405
Innerwick Castle 407
Castle of Dunbar 410
Tantallon Castle 427
The Bass Rock 438
Fast-Castle 446

ADVERTISEMENT.

[THIS Volume consists of an "ESSAY ON BORDER ANTIQUITIES," which formed the Introduction to a work, in two vols. 4to, published in 1814, under the title of "*Border Antiquities of England and Scotland, comprising specimens of Architecture, Sculpture, &c.;*"—and of "ESSAYS ILLUSTRATIVE OF PAINTINGS OF SCOTTISH SCENERY," first printed by Sir Walter Scott in the elegant Collection, entitled "*Provincial Antiquities and Picturesque Scenery of Scotland,*" 2 vols. 4to, 1825, 1826. The pictures which suggested these Essays were presented to Sir Walter Scott by the publishers of the work, and form the decoration of a small drawingroom at Abbotsford.]

AN

ESSAY

ON

BORDER ANTIQUITIES.

ESSAY

ON

BORDER ANTIQUITIES.

THE frontier regions of most great kingdoms, while they retain that character, are unavoidably deficient in subjects for the antiquary. The ravages to which they are exposed, and the life to which the inhabitants are condemned by circumstances, are equally unfavourable to the preservation of the monuments of antiquity. Even in military antiquities such countries, though the constant scene of war, do not usually abound. The reason is obvious. The same circumstances of alarm and risk require occupation of the same points of defence, and, as the modes of attack and of fortification change, the ancient bulwarks of cities and castles are destroyed, in order to substitute newer and more approved modes of defence. The case becomes different, however, when, losing by conquest or by union their character as a frontier, scenes once the theatre of constant battle, inroad, defence, and retaliation, have been for two hundred years converted into

the abode of peace and tranquillity. Numerous castles left to moulder in massive ruins; fields where the memory of ancient battles still lives among the descendants of those by whom they were fought or witnessed; the very line of demarcation, which, separating the two countries, though no longer hostile, induces the inhabitants of each to cherish their separate traditions,—unite to render these regions interesting to the topographical historian or antiquary. This is peculiarly the case on the border of Scotland and England. The recollection of their former hostility has much of interest and nothing of enmity. The evidences of its existence bear, at the same time, witness to the remoteness of its date; and he who traverses these peaceful glens and hills to find traces of strife, must necessarily refer his researches to a period of considerable antiquity. But it was not always thus; for, since the earliest period of which we have any distinct information, until the union of the crowns, the northern provinces of England, and the southern counties of Scotland, have been the scenes of inveterate hostilities, commenced and maintained with fury, even before the names of Scotland and England were acknowledged by history.

Our earliest authentic acquaintance with these transactions is during the Roman period of English history, and commences with the invasion of Agricola, whose efforts carried his invading arms almost to the extremity of Caledonia.

A. D. 81.

At this period the Border counties of England and Scotland were inhabited by three nations.

Those Britons lying to the east, and possessing one-half of Northumberland, and extending from the northern bank of the South Tyne to the Frith of Forth, were called the Ottadini.[1] Westward of this powerful nation lay the Gadeni, who held the west part of Northumberland, great part of Roxburgh-shire, Selkirk and Peebles shires, and extended also to the banks of the Forth, embracing West-Lothian. This country being mountainous, and remaining forest-ground to a late period, the Gadeni were probably a less populous nation than the inhabitants of the more fertile country to the east. Westward of the Gadeni, and extending to the sea-coast of the Atlantic, lay the Selgovæ, having the Solway Frith for their southern limit.[2] These nations Agricola found each occupying a strong country, and animated with the courage necessary to defend it. But their arms and discipline were unable to resist those of the Romans. A brief statement of their means of defence at this remote period naturally commences the Introduction to the Border Antiquities.

The towns of the ancient Britons were fortified in the ordinary manner of barbarians, with ditches, single or double, occupying the angles of the eminences, which were naturally selected for their

[1] [Mr Chalmers, in his *Caledonia*, (vol. i., p. 58,) considers "Ottadini" as the Roman corruption of a British word signifying "*the inhabitants of the country stretching out from the Tyne.*"]

[2] [Chalmers derives the name of the *Gadeni* from a word signifying *groves or forests;* and that of the *Selgovæ* from a term denoting "*dividing water.*"—*Caledonia*, vol. i., pp. 59, 60.]

site, and being, of course, irregular in their form. The earth was thrown up so as to form a steep *glacis* to the outside, and was sometimes faced with stones, in order to add to its height, and increase the acclivity; this formed the rampart of the place, and the gates, generally two or three in number, were placed where access was most convenient. One of the most perfect of these forts is situated in the neighbourhood of the celebrated Catrail, a work of antiquity to be afterwards briefly noticed, just where that limitary fence crosses the farm or Rink, belonging to Mr Pringle of Fairnilee.[1] The fort occupies the crest of an eminence near the junction of the rivers Tweed and Ettrick, which has an extensive prospect in every direction; and, though in the neighbourhood of higher hills, is too distant to be itself commanded by them in a military sense. There are two ramparts, the first of earth and loose stones, but the interior consisting of immense blocks of stone, disposed so as to form a rude wall, and faced with earth and turf within. The permanence of these massive materials seems to have ensured that of the building, for they defy all ordinary efforts of the agriculturist, too apt to consider such works as cumberers of the ground. The fortress has two gates, one to the east and the other to the west, with something like traverses for protecting and defending the approach. This remarkable fortress is surrounded by others of less consequence, serving as outposts, and has plainly

[1] [Robert Pringle, Esq. of Clifton and Fairnilee, &c. M. P for Selkirkshire. 1834.]

been a hill-fort of great importance belonging to the Gadeni. It is, probably, more ancient than the Catrail itself.

There are not to be found, on the Border, any of those vitrified appearances which are to be found in Craig Phactraig, and other Highland fortifications, and which seem to intimate that fire was used in building or in destroying them. We may therefore conclude, that the stones employed in constructing them were less fusible than those found in the shires of Forfar, Kincardine, and Aberdeen.

If we can trust a popular tradition, the singular ancient structures called Peghts, or Picts Houses, common in the Highlands, Western Isles, and Orcades, were also to be found in the Border. The inhabitants point out small rings, or elevated circles, where these *Duns*, as they are called, are said to have stood. In Liddesdale, particularly, more than one of these are shown. But whether, like those of Dun-Dornadilla in Sutherland, and Mousa in Shetland, they were built of stones arranged in the form of a glass-house, and containing a series of concentric galleries within the thickness of the wall, must be left to conjecture. Mr Chalmers seems to have considered them as common hill-forts.

These fortresses, so constructed, the natives defended with javelins and bows and arrows, the usual weapons of savages. The arrow-heads, made of flint, are frequently found, and are called, by the vulgar, elf-arrow-heads, from being, as they supposed, formed by the fairies or elves. At a later period, the Britons used copper and brass heads

for arrows, javelins, and spears, which are found of various sizes and shapes near their habitations. In like manner, from the specimens found on the Borders, there appears to have been a gradual improvement in the construction of battle-axes and weapons of close fight. The original Celts, or axes, are of polished stone, shaped something like a wedge. These are found of all sizes, some seeming intended for felling trees, and others for warlike purposes; and others again so very small, that they could only be designed for carving or dividing food.[1] When, however, this degree of refinement was attained, it was obvious that some improvement in the material of which the implements were formed, could not be far distant.

Accordingly, brass Celts, or battle-axes, seem to have been the next step in advance; and these are of various forms, more or less rude, as the knowledge of the art of working in metals began to advance. The first and most rude form of the brass Celt, usually found in the urns under sepulchral cairns, is a sort of brazen wedge, having an edge, however, rounded like that of an axe, about three inches broad in the face. The shape of these

1 These are certainly Celtic weapons; yet they cannot be considered as peculiar to that people. They have been found in considerable numbers in the Shetland Isles, which were evidently first settled by the Scandinavians. The natives suppose them to be thunderbolts, and account the possession of one of them a charm. Mr Collector Ross of Lerwick presented the author with six of these weapons found in Shetland. It is said the stone of which they are constructed cannot be found in those islands. The natives preserve them, from a superstitious idea that they are *thunderbolts*, and preserve houses against the effects of lightning.

weapons points out the probable mode of attaching them to handles, by hollowing out the sides, and leaving deep ledges; so that, if we conceive the abrupt angle at the root of an oak branch to have been divided by fire, the axe might have been inserted between the remaining pieces; and the whole being lashed fast by a thong, for securing which provision is often, though not uniformly, made by a loop in the brazen head, a battle-axe of formidable weight and edge was immediately obtained. The next step of improvement was that of casting the axe hollow instead of solid, so that the crooked part of the handle being inserted into the concave part of the axe as into a sheath, a far more solid and effectual weapon was obtained, and at less expense of metal, than when the handle was weakened by burning, and divided into two portions, which overlapped, as it were, the solid axe. It seems probable that the provincial Britons learned this improvement from their masters; for the hollow axes resemble those of the Romans in shape and size, and are sometimes decorated round the rim, where they join the handle, with a rude attempt at moulding. But the hollow axe was, like the more rude solid implement, secured to the handle by thongs, as the loop or fixed ring left for the purpose usually testifies.

The next step taken by the Britons in improving their warlike weapons, seems to have been the fastening the metal with which they were shod to the wooden handles, by means of broad-headed copper or brass nails, secured by similar heads on the opposite side, and thus effectually riveted to

the wood. This seems to have been the mode of shafting a weapon, like a very broad-headed javelin or spear, found near Friarshaugh, opposite to Melrose, the seat of John Tod, Esq.[1] This curious weapon is about a palm's-breadth at the bottom, tapering to the length of about nine inches, or perhaps more, (for it is considerably decayed towards the point,) dimensions greatly exceeding those of the Roman *pilum*, or javelin. It resembles pretty much those weapons which the Californian Indians manufacture out of copper, and secure, by broad-headed copper nails, to handles made of bone. These are now used by the Californians as they were probably employed by the Gadeni, or northern Britons in general, to complete and secure the union of the wooden shaft and metal head.

Short brazen swords of a peculiar shape are also occasionally, though rarely, found in those districts; they are uniformly formed narrow towards the handle, broad about the middle of the blade, and again tapering to a point at the extremity. Such weapons, by the common consent of antiquaries, have hitherto been termed Roman swords. They are, however, unlike in shape to those usually represented on Roman monuments, which are almost uniformly of an equal breadth from the handle, until they taper, or rather slope off suddenly, to form a sharp and double-edged

[1] Presented to the author by Mr Tod. Notwithstanding what is said in the text, it may, perhaps, be thought a specimen of the Roman pilum, though differing in the size and mode of shafting.

point. The metal employed may also lead us to doubt the general opinion which gives these weapons to the Romans. That the arts of Rome under the emperors, and for a length of time before, had attained to working steel, a metal so much superior to brass for the formation of military weapons, and its general use in manufacturing arms, is sufficiently testified by their employing the word *ferrum*, to signify battle in general. It may, no doubt, be urged, that in size and shortness the brass swords in question differ from the long blades generally used by barbarians. But, without stopping to consider the variety of weapons which might exist in different tribes; without dwelling on the awkward and useless increasing breadth and thickness of the blades in the middle, which look very like the first gradation from a club to a sword; without even founding upon the probability, that, after the Roman discipline had become known to the barbarians by fatal experience, they had tried (and certainly they had time enough to have done so) to make a rude imitation of the Roman sword in the metal which was most easily manufactured,—without resting upon any of these things, we may require the evidence that the Romans ever, within the period of their recorded history, used brazen swords. That the Greeks did so in the remote days of Homer, cannot be doubted,[1] and certainly from the same reason that we ascribe these weapons to the Britons, namely, that to fuse brass is a more easy and

[1] [See for example, *Iliad*, xix., l. 369.]

obvious manufacture than to work steel. But that the Romans ever employed swords of this inferior metal during the period of their history which is recorded, we have no warrant to believe. Virgil, an antiquary and a scholar, as well as a poet, in describing the various tribes of Italy, who assembled under Turnus, does indeed mention one nation whose warriors wore swords of brass—

> "Teutonico ritu soliti torquere cateias;
> Tegmina quis capitum raptus de subere cortex;
> Eratæque micant peltæ, micat æreus ensis."[1]
>
> *Æneid*, Lib. vii.

On this passage there are three things to be observed. First, that this mountain and rude tribe is described as retaining the ancient customs of the Teutones. Secondly, that the rest of their armour and weapons, as the helmets made of cork, and the Gallic sling, or harpoon called *cateia*, are given along with the brazen narrow buckler, or *pelta*, and the brazen sword in question, as marks of a rude tribe, unprovided with such weapons as the other Italians used at the supposed arrival of Æneas. Besides, swords of this description have been found in the Western Islands, or Hebrides, to which the Romans never penetrated; and they have also been found in Ireland. Nay, we are assured, that, in one instance, not only the sword-blades, but the mould for casting weapons of that description, have been found in the kingdom last mentioned,—

[1] ["And these (as was the Teuton use of old)
Wield brazen swords, and brazen bucklers hold,
Sling weighty stones when from afar they fight;
Their casques are cork, a covering thick and light."
DRYDEN.]

facts which certainly go far to establish that these brazen swords, which in breadth and thickness have a spherical form, are of British, not of Roman manufacture.

The battle array of the British in these northern districts, mountainous and woody, and full of morasses, must have been chiefly on foot. But we are assured by Tacitus that they, as well as the Southern Britons, used the chariot of war. All the Celtic chiefs seem to have gloried in being *carborne*, and are so described by the Welsh, the Irish, and the Gaelic bards. It is probable that men of distinction alone used this distinguished, but inconvenient, mode of fighting; and that as the cavalry of the Romans formed a separate rank in the state, so the *covinarii* in the northern parts of Britain consisted of the chiefs and their distinguished followers only. Indeed the difficulty which such squadrons must have found in acting, unless upon Salisbury plain, or ground equally level, must have rendered the use of them in the north rather a point of imposing splendour than of real advantage. The charioteers of the Caledonians do indeed seem to have made a considerable part of their force in the memorable battle which Agricola fought against Galgacus near the foot of the Grampian Hills. But we are to consider, that at this important period, common danger had driven the chiefs to form a general league, so that every sort of force which they could draw together appeared in its utmost proportion; and those war-chariots, assembled from all quarters, augmented by those also of the Southern Britons who had retired before the conqueror to

these last recesses of freedom, bore, probably, an unusual proportion to the extent of their forces. That they fought valiantly, the Romans themselves admit; and they certainly possessed the mode of managing that very awkward engine called a chariot of war, where even the lower grounds are unequal and broken by ravines and morasses, with as much, or more effect than the Persians, of a more ancient date, upon their extensive and level plains. There is, as far as we know, but one representation of a chariot of this period existing in Scotland. It occurs in the churchyard of Meigle, in a neighbourhood famous for possessing the earliest sculptural monuments respecting the events of antiquity. The chariot is drawn by a single horse, and carries two persons besides the driver.[1] Chariots used in war are the invention of a rude age, before men adventured to break horses for riding. In a rough country, like Scotland, they could be but rarely employed with advantage, and must soon have fallen into disuse.

Of the worship of the Northern Britons we have no distinct traces; but we cannot doubt that it was Druidical. The circles of detached stones, supposed to be proper to that mode of worship, abound in various places on the Border; and, although there may be good reason to doubt whether the presence of those monuments is in all other cases to be positively referred to the worship of the Druids,[2] yet there is no reason to think that the

[1] See an engraving in Pennant's Tour, [vol. iii., p. 166.]

[2] The most stately monument of this sort in Scotland, and probably inferior to none in England, excepting Stone-henge,

religion of the Ottadini, Gadeni, or Selgovæ, differed from that of the southern British tribes. We know, at least, one instance of the Druid's Adderstone, a glass bead so termed, being found on the Borders. This curious relic is now in possession of a lady in Edinburgh. They appear, however, to have worshipped some local deities, whom the urbanity of Roman paganism acknowledged and adopted with the usual deference to the religion of the conquered. In the station of Habitancum, now called Risingham, near the village of Woodbourn in Redesdale, was found a Roman altar dedicated to Mogon, a god of the Gadeni; and there is one in the Advocates' Library of Edinburgh inscribed to the *Divi Campestres*, or Fairies. It was found in the romantic vicinity of Roxburgh Castle.

The funeral monuments of the Celtic tribes on the Border are numerous, and consist of the cairns, or heaps of stones, so frequently piled on remark-

is formed by what are called the Standing Stones of Stenhouse, in the island of Pomona in the Orkneys, where it can scarcely be supposed that Druids ever penetrated; at least, it is certain, that the common people now consider it as a Scandinavian monument; and, according to an ancient custom, a couple who are desirous to attach themselves by more than an ordinary vow of fidelity, join hands through the round hole which is in one of the stones. This they call the promise of Odin. The Ting-walls, or places where the Scandinavians held their *comitia*, were surrounded by circles of stones as well as the places of Druid worship; and instances of this occur even in Norway. But, indeed, the general idea of setting up a circle of stones to mark the space allotted for the priests, or nobles, while the vulgar remained without its precincts, seems likely to be common to many early nations. [See Note to *The Pirate—Waverley Novels*, vol. xxv., p. 315.]

able spots. On opening them, there is usually found in the centre a small square enclosure of stones set on edge, with bones, and arms such as we have already described. There is frequently found within this stone-chest, or *cist-vaen*, as it is called by the Welsh, an urn filled with ashes and small beads made of coal. The manufacture of these urns themselves is singular. The skill of the artist appears not to have been such as to enable him to form his urn completely before subjecting it to the operation of the fire. He therefore appears to have first shaped the rude vessel of the dimensions which he desired, and then baked it into potter's-ware. On the vessel thus formed and hardened, he afterwards seems to have spread a very thin coat of unbaked clay, on which he executed his intended ornaments, and which was left to harden at leisure. The scrolls and mouldings thus hatched on the outside of these urns are not always void of taste. In these tombs and elsewhere have been repeatedly found the *Eudorchawg*, the *Torques*, or chain, formed of twisted gold, worn by the Celtic chiefs of rank. In the fatal battle of Cattraeth, in which the Celtic tribes of the middle marches sustained a decisive defeat from the Saxons who occupied Northumberland, Berwickshire, and Lothian, somewhere, probably, about the junction of Tweed and Ettrick,[1] and in the neighbourhood of the Catrail, there fell three hundred chieftains, all of whom, as appears from the elegy of Aneurin, a sad survivor of the

[1] [About half-a-mile above the House of Abbotsford.]

slaughter, wore the Torques of gold. It is not a chain forged into rings, but is formed of thin rods of flexible gold twisted into loops which pass through each other, and form oblong links. This ornament appears to have been common to the chiefs of all Celtic tribes; and undoubtedly Manlius had his surname of Torquatus from killing a Gallic chief so decorated. The brooch for securing the mantle has been repeatedly found in the Borders. It is also an ancient Celtic ornament.

The Druids are understood to have had no use of coins; yet it is singular, that, on a place near to Cairnmore in Tweeddale, there were found, along with a fine specimen of the *Eudorchawg*, a number of round drops of gold of different sizes, greatly resembling the coins of the native Hindhus, and of which it is difficult to make any thing unless we suppose them intended to circulate as specie. May it not be conjectured, that the provincial Britons fell on this expedient of maintaining a circulating medium of commerce, from the example of the Romans?

In the Lochermoss, near Dumfries, have been found canoes made out of a single trunk like those of Indians, which served the aboriginal inhabitants for the purposes of fishing. But in the time of the Romans, the Britons had acquired the art of making light barks, called *Curraghs*, covered with hides like the boats of the Esquimaux. This brief account of the hill-forts, sepulchres, arms, religion, and means of embarkment, possessed by the three

Celtic tribes whom the Romans found in possession of the Borders, completes a brief and general view of the British antiquities of the district.

The ROMAN Antiquities found in these districts are of such number and importance as might be expected from the history of their northern warfare, and the policy which they adopted to preserve their conquests. Even the ambition of a Roman conqueror, to extend as far as possible the limits of the empire, could not blind the successors of Agricola to the inconveniences which would be incurred in attempting a total conquest of Britain. That the invaders would defeat the natives as often as they might be imprudent enough to hazard a general action, was highly probable; but to win an engagement, or overrun a succession of mountains, lakes, towns, and morasses, was more easy than to establish and maintain amongst them the necessary garrisons and military points of communication, without which, the soldiers whom the victor might leave to maintain his conquests, must unquestionably have fallen victims to famine and the attacks of the barbarians. The Romans, therefore, renouncing the enticing but fallacious idea of maintaining a military occupation of the Caledonian mountains, set themselves seriously to protect such part of the island as was worth keeping and capable of being rendered secure. It may be much doubted, whether they paid even to the southern parts of Scotland the compliment of supposing them a desirable conquest. But to intersect them by roads, and occupy them with camps and garrisons,

was necessary for the protection of the more valuable country of England.[1]

Accordingly, the earliest measure taken for the protection of the Roman province in Britain, was the original wall of Hadrian, extending from the Frith of Solway to the mouth of the Tyne. Within this line the country was accounted civilized, and what was retained beyond it, was strongly occupied and secured by fortresses. At a later period, Lollius Urbicus, during the reign of Antoninus, formed a similar wall greatly in advance of the first, between the Friths, namely, of Forth and Clyde. It was a rampart of earth, with a deep ditch, military road, and forts, or stations, from point to point, but appears to have proved insufficient to curb the incursions of the tribes without the province, or to prevent the insurrection of those within its precincts. The Emperor Severus found the country betwixt the walls of Hadrian and that erected by Lollius Urbicus, during the reign of Antoninus, in such a state of disorder, that, after an expedition in order to intimidate rather than to subdue the more northern tribes, he appears to have fixed upon the more southern barrier as that which was capable of being effectually maintained and defended; and, although it is not to be presumed that he formally renounced the sovereignty of the space between the Friths of Solway and of the Forth and the Clyde,

A. D. 120.

A. D. 139.

[1] The learned author of Caledonia concludes, that these roads were extended even to the north of Aberdeenshire. It is impossible to mention this work without acknowledging with gratitude the brilliant light it has cast on many parts of Scottish history hitherto so imperfectly understood.

yet it is probable he only retained military possession of the most tenable stations, resting the ultimate defence of the province upon the wall of Hadrian, which he rebuilt with stone, and fortified with great care. Betwixt the years 211, being the era of the death of Severus, and 409, the date of the final abandonment of Britain by the Romans, the space between the two walls, entitled by the Romans the province of Valentia, was the scene of constant conflict, insurrection, and incursion; and towards the latter part of this tumultuous period the exterior line of Antoninus was totally abandoned, and the southern wall itself was found as insufficient as that of Antoninus to curb the increasing audacity of the free tribes.

From this brief deduction it may be readily conjectured that the Roman Antiquities found in the districts to which this Essay relates, must be chiefly of a military nature. We find, accordingly, neither theatres, baths, nor temples, such as have been discovered in Southern Britain, but military roads, forts, castles, and camps, in great abundance.

The principal Roman curiosity which the Border presents, is certainly the wall of Severus, with the various strong stations connected with it. The execution of all these military works bears the stamp of the Roman tool, which aimed at labouring for ages. The most remarkable is the wall itself, a work constructed with the greatest solidity and strength. The ravages continually made upon it for fourteen centuries, when any one in the neighbourhood found use for the well-cut stones of which it is built, have not been able to obliterate the

traces of this bulwark of the empire. The wall was twelve feet high, guarded by flanking towers and exploratory turrets, and eight feet broad, running over precipices and through morasses. The facing on both sides was of square freestone, the interior of rubble run in with quicklime between the two faces, and uniting the whole in a solid mass. The earthen rampart of Hadrian lies to the north of it, and might, in many places, be used as a first line of defence. It is not clear in what manner the Roman troops sallied from this line of defence when circumstances rendered it necessary. No gates appear except at the several stations. A paved military way may be traced parallel to the walls, in most places, for the purpose of sending reinforcements from one point to another. No less than eighteen *stations*, or fortresses, of importance, have been traced on the line of the wall. The most entire part of this celebrated monument, which is now, owing to the progress of improvement and enclosure, subjected to constant dilapidation, is to be found at a place called Glenwhelt, in the neighbourhood of Gilsland Spaw.[1]

[1] Its height may be guessed from the following characteristic anecdote of the late Mr Joseph Ritson, whose zeal for accuracy was so marked a feature in his investigations. That eminent antiquary, upon an excursion to Scotland, favoured the author with a visit. The wall was mentioned; and Mr Ritson, who had been misinformed by some ignorant person at Hexham, was disposed strongly to dispute that any relics of it yet remained. The author mentioned the place in the text, and said there was as much of it standing as would break the neck of Mr Ritson's informer were he to fall from it. Of this careless and metaphorical expression Mr Ritson failed not to make a memorandum, and afterwards wrote to

The number of forts and stations extending along the wall from west to east, some in front to receive the first attack of the enemy, some behind the wall to serve as rallying places, or to accommodate the troops destined to maintain the defence, render this magnificent undertaking upon the whole one of the most remarkable monuments of history. It differs from the Great Wall of China, to which it has been compared, as much as a work fortified with military skill, and having various gradations and points of defence supporting each other, is distinct from the simple idea of a plain curtain or wall. It was not until the hearts of the defenders had entirely failed them that the barbarous tribes of the north burst over this rampire.

With the same regard to posterity which dignified all their undertakings, the Romans were careful to transmit to us, by inscriptions still extant, the time at which these works were carried on, and the various cohorts and legions by whom different parts were executed. These, with altars and pieces of sculpture, have been everywhere dug up in the vicinity of the wall, and form a most valuable department of Border Antiquities, though not entering into the scope of the following work.

In advancing beyond the wall, the antiquary is struck by the extreme pains bestowed by the Romans to ensure military possession of the province

the author, that he had visited the place with the express purpose of jumping down from the wall in order to confute what he supposed a hyperbole. But he added, that, though not yet satisfied that it was quite high enough to break a man's neck, it was of elevation sufficient to render the experiment very dangerous.

of Valentia. No generals before or since their time appear to have better understood the necessity of maintaining communications. A camp, or station, of importance, is usually surrounded by smaller forts at the distance of two or three miles, and, in many cases, the communication is kept up, not only by the Iters, or military roads, which traverse the country in the direction of these fortresses, but by strong lines of communication with deep ditches and rampires. Of this there are some curious and complicated remains near Melrose, where a large triangular space lying betwixt the remarkable station on Eildon Hills and those of Castlesteads and of Caldshiels, is enclosed by ditches and ramparts of great depth. There appears to have been more than one British fortress within the same space, particularly one called the Roundabout, upon a glen termed Haxlecleuch, and another very near it upon the march between the properties of Kippilaw and Abbotsford. Besides these lines of communication, there is a military road which may be distinctly traced to the Tweed, which it appears to have crossed above Newharthaugh.[1] It is impossible, while tracing these gigantic labours, to refrain from admiring, on the one hand, the pains and skill which is bestowed in constructing them, and, on the other, the extravagant ambition which sti-

[1] Mr Chalmers, whose opinion is always to be mentioned with the utmost respect, seems inclined to think, that these intrenchments are the works of the provincial Britons, executed to protect them from the Saxons of Bernicia. Some bronze vessels and Roman antiquities, found by the author in improving that part of his property through which these lines run, warrant a different conclusion.

mulated the conquerors of the world to bestow so much pains for the preservation of so rude a country.

The frequent accompaniment of these camps is a Roman *tumulus*, or artificial mount, for depositing the remains of their dead, of which there is a very fine specimen on the south side of the Tweed, opposite to Sir Henry Hay Macdougal's beautiful mansion of Makerston. This *tumulus* appears to have belonged to the neighbouring camp on Fairnington Moor. In these specimens of Roman pottery have been found, probably lachrymatories and the vessels sacred to the *manes*, or souls, of the deceased. These mounts might also be used for exploratory purposes.

Around the stations have, in most instances, been found Roman coins, of all relics the most decisive, brazen axes, usually termed Roman, though perhaps not correctly to be regarded as such, and querns, or hand-mills, for grinding corn, made of two corresponding stones. Camp-kettles of bronze of various sizes are also found on the line of these roads, particularly where marshes have been drained for marl. It may, in general, be remarked, that, in Scotland, the decay of a natural forest is the generation of a bog, which accounts for so many antiquities being found by draining. Sacrificial vessels are also frequently discovered, particularly those with three feet, a handle, and a spout, which greatly resemble an old-fashioned coffee-pot without its lid.[1] Out of the intrench-

[1] [See an engraving in Pennant's Tour, vol. iii., p. 241.]

ment above mentioned, connecting the fort at Castleheads with that on Eildon Hills, was dug a pair of forceps of iron, much resembling smith's tongs. Inscriptions have rarely been found to the north of the wall.

Such are the evidences which still remind the antiquary, that these twelve districts once formed the fence and extreme boundary of the Roman power in Britain.

No reader requires to be reminded of the scenes of desolation which followed the abdication of the Romans. All exterior defences which the wall and the forts connected with it had hitherto afforded, were broken down and destroyed, while the Picts and Scots carried on the most wasteful incursions into the flourishing provinces of the south. But the learned and indefatigable Chalmers has plainly showed, that the tribes inheriting the late Roman province of Valentia were not subjugated by either of these more northern nations, but maintained a separate and precarious independence. These tribes, the reader will remember, were the Ottadini, Gadeni, and Selgovæ, to which were united, the Novantes of Galloway, and the Damnij of Clydesdale, who, like their Border neighbours, were enclosed between the two walls. It is probable that, according to the ancient British custom, they were governed by their separate chiefs, forming a sort of federal republic, whose array, in case of war, was subjected to the command of a dictator, termed the Pendragon. They did not long enjoy the full extent of their territory; for, as in other parts of England, so on her northern frontiers, the

invasion of the Saxons drove from their native seats the original inhabitants. It was not, however, until the year 547, that Ida, at the head of a numerous army of Anglo-Saxons, invaded and possessed himself of the greater part of Northumberland. These conquerors spread themselves on all sides, and became divided into two provinces, Deira and Bernicia. The Deirians occupied the northern division of Northumberland, with the bishopric of Durham, and made constant war with the British inhabitants of Westmoreland and Cumberland. The Saxons of Bernicia pushed their conquests northwards, possessed themselves of the ancient seats of the Ottadini and Gadeni, or the modern Berwickshire and lower part of Roxburghshire, seized on Lothian, were probably the first founders of Edinburgh, and warred fiercely with the natives now cooped up in the hilly country to the westward, as also with the Picts, who lay to the northward of these invaders. It seems highly probable that to this people we owe the Scoto-Saxon language of the Lowlands.[1] Their country is sometimes called Saxonia by ancient writers, being the Saxon part of Scotland. The line of demarcation, which then was the subject of dispute between the Saxons and Britons, extended north and south instead of east and west, like that

[1] The author has no hesitation to own that a film has fallen from his eyes on reading the *Caledonia* with attention. The Picts, as conjectured by Tacitus, might have been intermingled with settlers from Germany. But it seems probable that such emigrants merged in the main body of the Celtic tribes just as the Scandinavians did, who, at a later period, settled in the Hebrides and in Sutherland.

which afterwards divided Scotland from England. All good antiquaries allow, that the remarkable trench called the Catrail, which extends nearly fifty miles in the former direction, and may be traced from near the junction of the Gala and the Tweed to the mountains of Cumberland, was intended to protect the native inhabitants of Strath-Clwyde, for thus the remaining possessions of the Romanized Britons were entitled, from the too powerful Saxon invaders. It was natural that these provincial Britons should endeavour to make use of the same means of defence of which they had an example in the Prætentura of Antoninus, and the more elaborate wall of Severus. The imperfect execution of the Catrail plainly shows their inferiority of skill, while its length, and the degree of labour bestowed in the excavation, indicate their sense of its importance. This rampart is the most curious remnant of antiquity which can be distinctly traced to this distracted period. It is a ditch and rampart of irregular dimensions, but in breadth generally from twenty to twenty-four feet, supported by many hill-forts and corresponding intrenchments, indicating the whole to have been the work of a people possessing some remnants of that military skill of which the Romans had set the example. From what Mr Chalmers mentions of the course of Herrit's Dike, in Berwickshire, we may conjecture it to have been either a continuation of the Catrail, or a more early work of the same kind.[1] Supposing the latter to be the

[1] See *Caledonia*, vol. i., pp. 239-243.

case, it would seem that, when expelled from Lauderdale, the Britons fell back to the Catrail, as the Romans had done from the wall of Antoninus to that of Severus. The Catrail is very happily situated for the protection of the mountainous country, as it just commences where the valley of the Tweed becomes narrow and difficult of access, and skirts the mountains, as it runs southward. Contrary to other defences of the same sort, it was erected to save the mountaineers from the continued inroads of the inhabitants of the plains, whereas fortifications have generally been erected in the plains for precisely the opposite purpose.

It is remarkable, that the obscure contests of the Britons and Saxons yet survive in traditional song. For this we have to thank the institution of the Bards, the second rank to the Druids, and partaking of their sacred character. This order survived the fall of Druidism, and continued to perpetuate, while they exaggerated, the praise of the British chieftains who continued to fight in defence of the Cumbrian kingdom of Reged, and the more northern district of Strath-Clwyde. The chief of these bards, of whom we still possess the lays in the ancient British language, are Taliessin, Merlin of Caledonia, Aneurin, and Llywarch Hen. The two last appear to have been princes, and, contrary to the original rules of their order, they, as well as Merlin, were warriors.[1]

Urien of Reged, and his son Owen, both afford

[1] [See Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons, British Bards*, vol. i., book ii., and Sir Walter Scott's *Poetical Works*, vol. ix., p. 367, *note.*]

high matter for the songs of the bards; and it is to the Welsh poetry also that Arthur owes a commemoration, which, with the help of Geoffrey of Monmouth, was so extravagantly exaggerated by after minstrels. These native princes, however, do certainly appear to have maintained a long struggle with the Saxons, which was frequently successful, and might have been eventually so, had not the remains of the provincial Britons been divided into two petty kingdoms of Cumbria and Strath-Clwyde, and those tribes of warriors distracted by frequent disunion among themselves. As it was, they finally lost their independence. The last king of the Cumbrian Britons, called Dunmail, was slain in battle near Ambleside, on the lake of Winandermere, where a huge cairn, raised to his memory, is still called Dunmail-Raise, and his kingdom was ceded to Scotland by the conqueror Edward in 945. Strath-Clwyde, sometimes resisting, sometimes submitting, maintained a precarious independence until about 975, when Dunwallon, the last independent king of the Northern Britons, was defeated by Kenneth III., King of the Scots, and is said to have retired to the cloister.

But although the kingdoms of Reged and Strath-Clwyde were thus melted down into the general mass of Scottish subjects, yet the British inhabitants of Valentia continued long distinguishable by their peculiar manners, customs, and laws. When Edward I. was desirous to secure his usurpation of the Scottish crown, by introducing the feudal system in its full extent, and thus assimilating the

laws of England and Scotland, he declares, that the "customs of the Scots and the Brets shall for the future be prohibited, and no longer practised;" and that the king's lieutenant should submit to an assembly of the Scottish nation "the statutes made by David King of Scots, and the amendments made by other kings." It was probably at this time that the law treatise, entitled *Regiam Majestatem*, was compiled, with the artful design of palming upon the Scottish parliament, under the pretence of reviving their ancient jurisprudence, a system as nearly as possible resembling that of England. Now it is proved that, until a late period, that part of modern Scotland which lay to the south of the river Forth, and bordered on the east with the Saxon province of Lothian, or Loden, was still called Britain. Accordingly, Fordun terms Stirling a castle situated in *Scotland* on the confines of Britain, and says that the seal of the town of Stirling bore this legend,

> "Continet hoc in se pontem castrum Strivilense
> Hic armis Bruti hic stant Scoti cruce tuti."

As the names of Britain and Scotland were thus preserved, the customs alluded to by Edward as proper to be abolished, were those which the Scots and Britons, both nations of Celtic original, had transmitted to their descendants, and which, from the spirit of independence which they breathed, were naturally hostile to the Conqueror. It is probable that the clan-customs and regulations were amongst those alluded to by Edward's prohibition; at least, we shall presently see that they were the subject of jealousy to future legislators.

While the Northern Britons were maintaining the dubious and sanguinary resistance against the Saxons which we have briefly noticed, the invaders themselves were disturbed in their operations of conquest by the arrival of fresh hordes from Scandinavia, whose inroads were as distressing to the Saxon inhabitants of Northumberland and Lothian as those of their ancestors had been to the British Ottadini, whom they had expelled from those fertile provinces. The celebrated Ragnar Lodbrog, renowned in the song of Scalds, led the first attack by the Danes on Northumberland. He fell;[1] but his death was promptly and dreadfully avenged by the fresh invasion headed by his sons, Inguar and Hubba. They appear totally to have subverted the Saxon kingdom of Northumberland founded by Ida, and to have conquered the country as far south as York, and penetrated westward as far as Stanemore, where their invasion added to the distressed condition of the Cumbrian Britons. Aided by frequent descents of their roving countrymen, they wasted and they warred in these northern regions;[2] and though

A. D. 876.

[1] [" Ragnar Lodbrog, the most terrible and resistless of the fierce and unresting Sea Kings of the north—to whom life had no employment and no delight, save those of war and plunder—after a long series of successful piracies, his forces were at length overpowered by numbers, and himself taken prisoner. Ella, little foreseeing the direful consequences to himself and to all England, commanded his captive to be thrown into a loathsome dungeon, there to perish miserably among serpents."—See TURNER's *History of the Anglo Saxons*, vol. ii., ch. 8, 9.]

[2] [" After conquest of Ella's kingdom, the sons of Ragnar inflicted a no less cruel and inhuman retaliation on Ella for

they nominally acknowledged the royalty of Edward the Elder, the Northumbrian Danes could hardly be termed subjects of a Saxon monarch, until they were defeated by Athelstane, in the bloody and decisive battle of Brunnanburgh. The wild convulsions of the period sometimes occasioned a temporary disunion even after this engagement; but such incidents may be regarded rather as insurrections than as a re-establishment of Northumbrian independence.

It is natural to enquire what traces still remain of the Danish invaders? The circular camps found in many places of Northumberland, and on the borders of Cumberland, are plausibly ascribed to them, and the names of their deities have been imposed upon several tracts in the same district. But we find none of those Runic monuments so common in their own country, either because they never possessed tranquillity sufficient to aim at establishing such records, or that they were destroyed in after ages out of hatred to the Danish name. The taste of the Scalds, however, is to be traced in the early English poetry which was first cultivated in the North of England. The northern minstrels could derive no lessons from the bards who spoke the Celtic language, their earliest attempts at poetry were, therefore, formed on alliteration; and as late as the time of Chaucer it was considered as the mark of a northern man to "affect

their father's sufferings. They cut the figure of an eagle on his back, divided his ribs to tear out his lungs, and agonized his lacerated flesh by the addition of the saline stimulant." —Turner, vol. ii., p. 123.]

the letter."[1] Further of the Danes antiquaries can trace but little. Their independent sovereignty in Northumberland was as brief as it was bloody; and their descendants, mixing with Saxons, and what few might remain of the Southern Ottadini, formed the mixed race from which, enriched by the blood of many a Norman baron, the present Northumbrians are descended.

In the tenth century, the frontiers of England and Scotland, which had now begun to assume these distinctive appellations, differed greatly from the relations they bore to each other in subsequent ages. The district of the Ottadini, conquered first by the Saxons, and afterwards by the Danes, extended from the Tyne, and sometimes even from the Humber, to the shores of the Frith of Forth. Berwickshire of course, and Lothian, made part of its northern division, called Bernicia. These counties were often the scene of inroad to the nation of Scots and Picts, now united under the same monarch, and might occasionally be occupied by them. But regularly and strictly speaking, they, as well as the city of Edinburgh, (Edwins-burgh,) may be considered as part of England. It acquired in time the name of Lothian, an epithet not only conferred on the counties now comprehended under that term, but also including Berwickshire, afterwards called the March.[2] The *Lodenenses*, dis-

[1] Chaucer's Parsone apologizes for not reciting a piece of poetry—

"But trusteth wel I am a sotherne man,
I cannot geste, *rom*, *ram*, *ruf*, by my letter,
And, God wot, rime hold I but litel better."

[2] Simeon of Durham, narrating the journey of the papal

tinguished in the battle of the Standard and elsewhere, were the people of this south-eastern district; and the district appears to have been included amongst those for which, as English possessions, the King of Scotland did homage to his brother of England.[1] Thus Scotland was, at this early period, deprived of those fertile south-eastern provinces. On the other hand, the south-western frontier of Scotland was enlarged beyond its present bounds by the possession of the ancient British kingdom of Reged, or Cumberland. This was ceded to Malcolm I. by Edmund, after the defeat of Dunmail, the last King of Cumbria. The cause of the cession is obvious. The people of Cumberland were of the same race and manners with those of the Britons of Strath-Clwyde who occupied the opposite frontier of Scotland; and Edmund, who retained but a doubtful sovereignty over Northumberland, would have been still more embarrassed by the necessity of retaining, by garrisons or otherwise, so wild and mountainous a country as the British Reged. By yielding it to

legate to Scotland, has these remarkable words,—"Pervenit apud fluvium Tuedam qui Northumbriam et Loidum determinat, in loco qui Rothesburche vocatur."

[1] Malcolm IV. acknowledged himself vassal to the crown of England for the county of Lothian, (among other possessions,) a circumstance which has greatly embarrassed Scottish antiquaries, who are very willing to discover the Comitatus Lodenensis in Leeds or in Cumberland. The fact is, however, that the true meaning rather fortifies the plea of independence. For Lothian, in this enlarged sense, was just the ancient Bernicia, peopled with Saxons or English, and Malcolm did homage for it, not as part of Scotland, but as part of England.

Malcolm, he secured a powerful ally capable of protecting the western frontier of Northumberland, and to whose domination the Cumbrians might be the more readily disposed to submit, as it united them with their brethren the Britons of Strath-Clwyde. We have already seen that these districts, as far as the Forth, though under the dominion of the Scottish kings, were termed Britain, in opposition to Scotland proper.

But in the year 1018, Malcolm II. enlarged the eastern limits of his kingdom to the present frontier of Scotland, by a grant from Eadulf, Earl of Northumberland, who ceded to him the whole district of Lothian and Berwickshire to the Tweed. This important addition to his kingdom he certainly continued to retain, although the English historians pretend that Canute carried his arms into Scotland, and penetrated far northwards. If such was the case, his invasion A. D. 1031. and victory remained without fruits.

What the Scottish kingdom acquired on the eastward in the reign of Malcolm II., was balanced by the loss of Cumberland, which William the Conqueror wrenched from Malcolm Canmore. After this period, although Stephen, in his necessity, ceded Northumberland to Scotland, and, although the English on the other hand frequently held military possession of part of the opposite country, the Borders, with the exception of the Debateable Land to the west, and the town of Berwick on the east, which were constant subjects of dispute, might be considered as finally settled according to the present limits.

While these transactions occurred, other most important changes having taken place both in the interior of South and North Britain, had amalgamated these two grand divisions of the island each into one great kingdom, so that the regions, where they bordered on each other, ceasing to be the residence of independent or tributary states, assumed the character of frontiers, or, as we now term them, of Borders. This important consolidation of England and Scotland, each into a distinct and individual monarchy, took place in both countries nearly about the same period. At least, although the present kingdom of England was formed by the consolidation of the states of the heptarchy rather more early than the Scottish nations were united into one state, the distractions, occasioned by Danish invasions and civil wars, prevented her extending her empire over her northern neighbours. Indeed, the power of England could scarce be said to be wielded by one sovereign with uncontrolled sway, until William the Conqueror had repressed the various insurrections of the Saxons, subjugated for ever the tumultuary Northumbrians, and acquired a consolidated force capable of menacing the kingdom of Scotland. Had this event happened a century sooner, it is probable all Britain would, at that early period, have been united under one monarch. Or had a Scottish monarch existed during the heptarchy, as powerful as Malcolm Canmore at a subsequent era, it is possible that he might have pushed his limits much farther to the south than the present Borders, and would probably have

secured to Scotland at least the countries on the north of the Humber. As it happened, the situation and balanced strength of both countries dictated the present limits.

The Saxons, who gave name to England, and language to both nations, now began to disappear from the stage. The local antiquities which are ascribed to them on the Borders are not numerous. Their coins, as well as those of the Danish dynasty, are frequently found both in England and Scotland; and cups and drinking horns have been preserved and discovered, which may be referred to this period. But of their architecture the ecclesiastical edifices afford almost the only specimen. The houses, even of their princes, were chiefly formed of wood; and their military system consisted rather in giving battle than in attacking or defending places of strength. Some rude ramparts seem to have encircled their towns for protection against the Danish invaders, and in their own civil dissensions. But castles, whether belonging to kings or chiefs, must have been rare during the Saxon period. No specimens survive on the Border, or even farther south, unless the very singular edifice, called Coningsburgh Castle, near Sheffield, be considered as a specimen of Saxon military architecture. The Keep is round instead of being square as usual; and, being supported by six huge projecting buttresses, has a massive, and, at the same time, a picturesque appearance. The mortar is of a kind much more imperfect than that which is used in the Norman buildings, having a mixture of ashes and charcoal and very little lime. In this

place the Saxons certainly had a castle, as appears from the name, and tradition points out in its vicinity the *tumulus* of the celebrated Hengist. But it is probable that the Saxon building was repaired and improved by William de Warren the Norman baron, on whom it was bestowed by the Conqueror.[1]

If the Saxons left few examples of their military architecture, they laid the foundation of many splendid ecclesiastical establishments. Once the most fierce, they appear, on their conversion, to have become the most devout nation of Europe. Christianity, though such advantage should not be named with her inestimable spiritual benefits, brought the arts to Britain in her train. Paulinus, one of the missionaries, who, by orders of Pope Gregory, had accompanied to Britain the intrepid Saint Augustin, made great progress in the conversion of Northumberland about the year 625. At Yevering, now an obscure hamlet, about two miles from Wooler, then the royal residence of Edwin, King of Northumberland, and his pious spouse, Ethelburga, Paulinus abode thirty-six days in company with the sovereigns, daily employed in instructing the heathen inhabitants, and baptizing them in the neighbouring river called the Glen. The first church which this zealous and successful missionary constructed in Northumberland was that of Lindesfarne, or Holy Island. It was formed entirely of wood. But the use of stone was speedily introduced, and the art improving in proportion to the

[1] [See *Ivanhoe—Waverley Novels*, vol. xvii., p. 330, and *note*, p. 335.]

encouragement which it received, began, during the eighth and ninth centuries, to assume a more regular and distinct form. The Saxon style of architecture, as it is called with more propriety than that by which the style that succeeded it is termed Gothic, had now assumed a determined character. Massive round arches, solid and short pillars, much gloom and an absence of ornament, mark this original mode of building. It is also remarkable for a peculiar style of architectural decoration, described by Mr Turner in his excellent history of the Anglo-Saxons, as being a universal diagonal ornament, or zigzag moulding, "disposed in two ways, one with its point projecting outwards, the other with its point lying so as to follow the lines which circumscribe it, either horizontal, perpendicular, or circular." There is a curious specimen of this ornament on a door-way in the ruinous part of the Abbey-Church at Jedburgh,[1] which looks into the clergyman's garden, which is richly arched with this species of moulding. In the Chapter-House at the same place may be seen a very perfect specimen of Saxon architecture.

The Saxon historians expatiate with a sort of rapture on the magnificence which Wilfred, Bishop of York, displayed in the erection of a church at Hexham. It was raised by masons and pargeters brought from Italy, who garnished the building by winding stairs, elevated it into Roman magnificence, and decorated its walls A. D. 674.

[1] Jedworth, or Jedburgh, was founded A. D. 825. See *Caledonia*, vol. i., p. 426.

and vaults with pillars, ornamental carving, oratories, and chapels. Perhaps we may suspect a little exaggeration in this description; for the same authorities assure us, with little probability, that when Wilfred attempted the conversion of the South Saxons, they were rendered so miserable by famine, that they were in the habit by forty at a time to hold each other by the hands and throw themselves into the sea; and that they were so little able to secure themselves from this evil, that, till instructed by Saint Wilfred, they were ignorant of catching any fish but eels. A state so grossly savage in Sussex is scarce to be reconciled with a favourable progress in the arts so much farther to the northward. Still, however, religion appears to have flourished in these savage districts.

Aidan, a monk of Saint Columba's monastery of Iona, was, in 1634, named Bishop of Lindesfarne, or Holy Island, which became soon a renowned seminary. Melrose, a classical name, owed its original foundation to the same Aidan; and, as the holy flame spread around and increased, the abbeys of Coldingham and Tyningham were erected. These buildings, like the church of Lindesfarne, were originally fabricated of wood, and afterwards arose in more durable materials. But of these, and of other Saxon edifices, only fragments can now be traced. The unsparing fury of the heathen Danes destroyed almost all the churches on the Borders, and only in a very few favoured instances can the Saxon architecture be distinguished. Even its remnants are rendered indistinct by the repairs and additions of later ages. The ancient

vaults beneath the present church at Hexham, which have been constructed chiefly by the use of materials fetched from some Roman station, as appears from the inscriptions in Horsley's work, are probably the only part remaining of the magnificent church of Wilfred. In Holy Island a few diagonal mouldings and circular arches flatter the fancy of the antiquary that they may have been part of Saint Cuthbert's original church. At Jedburgh, the Chapter-House and one highly enriched door-way have been already noticed. In Kelso Abbey-Church the whole arches and ornaments of the building are decidedly in the Saxon style, and its noble, concentrated, and massive appearance forms one of the most pure and entire, as well as most favourable, specimens of that order, which occur on the Scottish Border. The young student of antiquities is not, however, to set it down as a rule, that, where such ornaments and arches occur, the edifice exhibiting them is indubitably as old as Saxon times. The architecture which had arisen among the Saxons was practised among their successors, not only until the Gothic, as it is called, was introduced, but even in many later instances, from taste, or with a view to variety. It is probable that the Cumbrian Britons and those of Reged mingled with the Christian religion circumstances expressive of their own ancient manners and customs; but of this we have little evidence. We may refer, however, to this period, the remarkable monument at Penrith, consisting of two huge stone pillars, richly engraved with hieroglyphics, with a sepulchral stone extended between them. The

common tradition terms this the monument of Sir Ewain Cæsarius, a champion who cleared the neighbouring forest of Inglewood of wild beasts.

The edifices upon the Border, dedicated to devotion and peace, arose the more frequently that the good understanding between the English and Scottish nations was for some time only interrupted by occasional and brief wârs, bearing little of the character of inveterate hostility which afterwards existed between the sister kingdoms, even in the time of peace. In fact, until the conquest of England by the Normans, and for ages afterwards, each monarch was so earnestly employed in the consolidation of his authority over the mixed tribes to whom it extended, that he had no time for forming schemes of ambition at the expense of his neighbour. If the English frontier regions contained aboriginal Britons, Saxons, Danes, and Normans, the subjects of Scotland were even more miscellaneous. The Picts and Scots had now, indeed, melted down into one people, bearing the latter name; but the Scoto-Britons of Reged still retained a distinct, though no longer an independent, existence. This was still more the case with the people of Galloway, who, lying more remote from the authority of the kings of Scotland, gave them apparently no other obedience than that which was formerly yielded by the British tribes to the Pendragon, or chief of their federation. There remain to be noticed the Scoto-Saxons, being the descendants of those, who, in earlier times, had colonized the northern division of Bernicia, extending from the banks of the

Tweed to the Frith of Forth, and skirting on the west the kingdom of Strath-Clwyde. These Saxons were gradually augmented by such of their countrymen as the civil broils of the heptarchy, the invasion of the Danes, and, finally, the sword of the Normans, drove to seek shelter among their northern brethren; and such was the number of these fugitives, and the influence which they attained at the court of the Scottish monarch, that their language came to be in general use, and at length to supersede the various dialects of the Celtic, which were probably spoken by the other tribes. It cannot but be considered as a very singular phenomenon, that the inhabitants of a ceded province, and that not a large one, should give language to the whole kingdom, although both their original churchmen and royal family were certainly Celtic. But Lothian and the Merse, as the most fertile parts of Scotland, had a natural attraction for her monarchs; and the Saxon language, refined and extended as it must have been by the new emigrants from England, possessed the power of expressing wants and acquisitions unknown to the more simple Celtic nations. It is probable, also, from the expression of Tacitus, that among the various tribes who inhabited the eastern shores of Scotland, particularly about the mouth of the Tay, there might be several of German descent, by whom the Saxon would be readily adopted. Above all, the reader must observe, that, although the Christian missionaries came originally from the Celtic seminary of Iona, yet the large foundations of Lindesfarne,

Hexham, Melrose, Coldingham, Jedburgh, and others on the Borders, were endowed by Saxon munificence, and filled with Saxon monks, who disseminated their language along with their religion through such tribes as still used the British or Celtic tongue. The authority of these Saxon ministers of religion must have been the more prevalent, as they were held to teach a more orthodox doctrine concerning a very important point of controversy—the keeping of Easter—than their Scottish brethren. On this subject, Queen Margaret, wife of Malcolm Canmore, employed against the Scottish heresy "the sword of the spirit," combating their errors three days, like "St Helena," says the encomiast, "converting the Jews." Her warlike and royal spouse acted as interpreter on this occasion between his zealous consort and the Scottish clergy, a circumstance which proves that he understood both Saxon and Celtic, she the former language only. It also establishes this fact, that the Lowland Scotch had not yet spread generally through the Celtic tribes, though it did so afterwards.

To the nations already mentioned as subjects of Scotland, must be added the Norman families, who, expelled from England by the various convulsions which took place in that scene of their new conquest, or voluntarily abandoning it in consequence of discovering their services ill recompensed by the Conqueror, were attracted to Scotland by the munificence of Malcolm Canmore. The weak prince, who succeeded that active and enterprising monarch, in vain adopted a different

line of policy from his, and laboured to banish from Scotland those foreigners who had settled there under his auspices,—a savage and inhospitable measure, by which Donald Bane endeavoured to gain favour with the Scottish tribes, who longed to return to the wild manners of their forefathers. But Alexander I., though himself of a disposition so stern as to acquire the surname of The Fierce, yet, connected with England by marriage, again encouraged the settlement of foreigners in his realm, and the Norman barons, with their retainers, flocked thither in such numbers, that David I. addresses his charters to his feal subjects, Franks, English, Scottish, and Galwegians; and his son Henry classes the inhabitants of his county of Northumberland into Franks (*i. e.* Normans) and English.

The Normans brought with them their rules of chivalry, their knowledge of the military art, their terms of honour and badges of distinction, and, far the most important, their feudal system of laws. It is not to be supposed that these were at once imposed on the Scottish nation at large, as has been erroneously asserted by the ancient historians of that people. But the fiction of law which considered the sovereign as the original source of all property, and which held the possessors of land by that very act of possession amenable to his courts, and liable to serve in his armies, rendered the system acceptable to the king, while the great barons, being each in their degree invested with the same right and authority within their own domains, were satisfied to submit to the paramount superiority of

the crown, distant as it was, and feebly exercised, in consideration of their own direct authority over their vassals being recognised and acknowledged by the same system. The king, by whom grants of land were made, and the nobles to whom they were given, had thus every motive for adopting the feudal form; not to mention that the Norman barons, on whom such marks of regal bounty were conferred, would not have accounted that they possessed them securely, unless they had been expressed in the manner to which the law of their own country had familiarized them. Thus, while in England the feudal law was suddenly imposed in consequence of the Norman conquest, it gradually glided into Scotland, recommended at once by its own well-modelled and systematic arrangement, by the interests of the king and of the nobles, and the principle of imitation among the inferior gentry. The clergy, doubtless, lent their aid to the introduction of the new system, which, while it imposed no new burdens on their property, gave them at once a firmer and more durable species of land rights, and sundry facilities for exercising their superior knowledge of law, and of legal documents, at the expense of the laity. At what time the feudal system was entirely adopted through the Lowlands of Scotland, it would be difficult to ascertain. We have already seen that the laws of the ancient inhabitants, the customs, as they are called, of the Scots and Bretts, were in some observance during the temporary usurpation of Scotland by Edward I., and that it appears to have been the purpose of that wily monarch, by abolishing these

usages, and introducing into the Scottish law a universal observance of the feudal system, to prepare the way for a more complete union between his usurped and his hereditary dominions. One leading feature of Celtic manners and laws remained, however, upon the Borders, until the union of the crowns; and, in despite of the feudal system with which it was often at variance, continued to flourish as well in the southern as in the northern extremities of Scotland. This was the system of septs, or clanship, by which these districts were long distinguished.

The patriarchal government of each tribe, or name, by a single chieftain, supposed to represent in blood the father from whom the whole sept claim their original descent, is, of all kinds of government, the most simple and apparently the most universal. It is deduced from the most primitive idea of all authority, that right of command which is exercised by a father over his family. As the wigwams of the grandchildren arise round the hut of the patriarch, the power of the latter is extended in a wider circumference; and, while the increasing numbers of the tribes bring them into contact, and of course into disputes with other societies of the same kind, this natural HEAD (such is the literal interpretation of the Norman word Chef, or the Celtic Cean) is more extensively useful, as their counsellor in peace and captain in battle. This simple mode of government, very similar to what now exists among the Persian and Hindhu tribes, was universal among the ancient Celtic nations. A confederation of a certain num-

ber of these tribes, or clanships, under a government, whether monarchical or popular, composed a Celtic kingdom, or state, but did not alter, or interfere with, the authority exercised by each chief over his own tribe. Thus, ancient Gaul was divided into sixty-four states, comprehending four hundred different tribes; which makes a proportion of about six clans to each federal union. In Britain, in like manner, Cæsar enumerates no less than four kings in the province of Kent alone, by which he must have meant four patriarchal chieftains. That such was the original government of Britain, is sufficiently evident from the system of clanship being found in such perfection in Wales, whose inhabitants, driven into the recesses of their mountains by the Saxons, long maintained with their independence the manners of the ancient British. They acknowledged five royal tribes, and five of churl's blood, to one or other of which each genealogist could refer the pedigree of the subordinate septs. That Ireland, unbroken and untouched by the Romans or Saxons, should have possessed the system of clanship in all its perfection, cannot be matter of surprise. In the Highlands of Scotland, the system became only extinct in the days of our fathers.[1] And, therefore, as

[1] ["By the act of 20th King George II., cap. 5, all tenures by wardholding, that is, where the vassal held lands for the performance of military service, were declared unlawful, and those which existed were changed into holdings for feu, or for blench tenures,—that is to say, either for payment of an annual sum of money, or some honorary acknowledgment of vassalage,—so that it became impossible for any superior or overlord, in future, to impose upon his vassals the fatal service

being found in all countries where dialects of the Celtic are spoken, and where their customs continued to be preserved, we must account the system of clanship as peculiar to the Celtic tribes, and unknown to the various invaders of Britain, whether Saxons, Danes, or Normans. As it continued to retain full force upon the Borders, we must hold that it was originally derived from the Celtic inhabitants of the western parts of Valentia, who remained unsubdued by the Saxons, and by those of Reged, or the modern Cumberland.

Nor does it at all shake this conclusion, that none of the clans distinguished upon the Borders used the Celtic patronymics common in Ireland, Wales, and the Scottish Highlands, and that we are well assured that several of them are of Saxon or Norman descent. In this case, as in Ireland, the Saxon or Norman settlers seem to have readily conformed to the custom of the native inhabitants, and to have adopted the name and authority of chiefs, with as much readiness and as effectual patriarchal sway, as if they had been descended from Galgacus or Cadwallader. A vague tradition asserts, that the number of Scottish Border clans was eighteen, and of those of the Highlands

of following him to battle, or to discharge the oppressive duties of what were called hunting, hosting, watching, and warding. Thus, although the feudal forms of investiture were retained, all the essential influence of the superior or overlord over the vassal or tenant, and especially the right which he had to bring him into the field of battle, in consequence of his own quarrels, was in future abrogated and disallowed."—*Tales of a Grandfather*, 3d series, vol. iii., p. 353.]

forty-eight; but I presume there is no genealogist now alive who would undertake to repeat the list. At a late period in the history of the Borders, the Scottish parliament, for the purpose of checking the depredations of these septs, published a "Roll of the Clans that has Captains and Chieftains, on whom they depend ofttimes against the Will of their Landlords, as well on the Borders as Highlands," which, with some brief remarks on Border names, will be found in the Appendix to this Introduction.[1]

The system of clanship thus established on the western and middle parts of the Border, spread its influence into Berwickshire also; for, although the potent family of Gordon, or of Home, has not, in the strictest sense, been termed a clan, that is, a sept depending entirely upon one patriarchal head, and of which the common people, as well as the leaders, bore the same name, yet the heads of the branches of these great families added to their extensive feudal and territorial influence that authority of blood which they exercised over the barons of their own name, as was the case with the Butlers, Geraldines, and other great Norman families settled in Ireland. But on these eastern parts of the marches, this clannish attachment was less strong and inviolable, and there are more frequently instances of persons of distinction acting against the head of their family upon occasions of public distraction.[2] The same thing may be observed on

[1] See Appendix No. III.

[2] In the civil wars of Queen Mary, Godscroft (himself a Home) informs us, after enumerating the royalists, that

the opposite Borders of England. Northumberland, at least the more level parts of that county, from which the British had been long expelled, was occupied by families of power and distinction, who exercised the same feudal and territorial authority that was possessed by other landholders throughout England. But in the wild and mountainous dales of the Reed, the Tyne, and the Coquet, as well as in the neighbouring county of Cumberland, the ancient British custom of clanship still continued in observance, and the inhabitants acted less under the direction of their landlords than under that of the principal man of their name, corresponding in this respect with the manners of the Cumbrian Britons, from whom they derived their descent. This grand distinction should be heedfully kept in view by the antiquary; because the mode of government, of living, and of making war, adopted by the Borderers on both sides, seems to have been in a great measure the consequence of this prevailing system of clanship.

The simplicity of the system was its first and principal recommendation. The father is the natural magistrate among those of his own family, and his decisions are received with respect, and obeyed without murmur. Allow the fiction (for such it must frequently have been) that the existing chief was the lineal descendant and representative of the common parent of the tribe, and he became the

"the Lord Home did also countenance them, though few of his friends or name were with him, save one mean man, Ferdinando of Broomhouse."—*History of the Douglasses.* Folio edit. p. 311.

legitimate heir of his paternal authority. But the consequences of this doctrine led directly to despotism; and indeed it is upon this very foundation that Sir Robert Filmer, the slavish advocate of arbitrary power, has grounded his origin of magistracy. The evil, however great in a more advanced state of society, was not felt by tribes of bounded numbers, and engaged constantly in war. As soldiers, they felt the necessity of submitting absolutely to their leader, while he exerted his authority with tolerable moderation; and, as commanding soldiers, the chief must have felt the hazard of pushing discipline into tyranny. There were also circumstances which balanced the inconvenience of being subjected to the absolute authority of the chieftain. He was not only the legislator and captain and father of his tribe, but it was to him that each individual of the name looked up for advice, subsistence, protection, and revenge.

The article of counsel, it may be supposed, was mutual; for it is reasonably to be presumed, that the chieftain would, in any matter of great moment, use the advice of the persons of most consequence in the clan; as, on the other hand, it was a natural part of his duty to direct and assist them by his opinion and countenance.

The support assigned by the chief to his people was so ample, as to render it questionable whether he could call much proper to himself, excepting his horses and arms. However extensive his territories were, he could use no part of them for his own peculiar profit, excepting just so much as he was able (perhaps by incursions upon the neigh-

bouring kingdom) to stock with sheep and with black cattle, which were consumed in the rude festivals of his castle faster than they could be supplied by the ordinary modes of raising them. The rest of the lands he distributed among his principal friends and relations, by whom they were managed in the same way, that is, partly stocked with cattle for the use of the laird, and partly assigned to be the temporary possessions of the followers. The vassals, or, to speak more properly, the men of name among the kindred, sometimes assisted the revenues of the chief by payment of the various feudal casualties, when he happened to be their feudal superior as well as patriarchal captain. But these seem frequently to have been remitted "in respect of good and acceptable service," and most probably were at all times levied with a very lenient hand. Payment of rent was totally unknown on the Borders until after James's accession to the crown of England, and thus the chief's superior wealth consisted in his extensive herds and flocks. Here also the inhabitants of the Borders gave token of their Celtic origin. To live on the produce of their flocks, to be independent of the use of bread, to eat in quantity the flesh of their cattle, are attributes which Lesley ascribes to the Borderers in Queen Mary's time, and which also apply to the Welsh and the Irish. On the splendour with which the chief practised his rude hospitality, much of his popularity, and of course much of his power, depended. Those who rose to great consequence were in the custom of maintaining constantly in their castles a certain number of the younger and

more active warriors of the clan, as we shall have afterwards occasion to notice more particularly. And thus all the chief means of subsistence were expended in the service of his clan.

Protection was the most sacred duty of a chief to his followers, and this he was expected to extend in all forms and under almost all circumstances. If one of the clan chanced either to slay a man, or commit any similar aggression, the chief was expected to defend him by all means, legal or illegal. The most obvious and pacific was to pay such fine, or *amende*, or assythement, as it was called, as might pacify the surviving relations, or make up the feud.[1] This practice of receiving an atonement for slaughter seems also to have been part of the ancient Celtic usages; for it occurs in the Welsh laws of Howell Dha, and was the very foundation of the Irish Brehon customs. The vestiges of it may be found in the common law of Scotland to this day. But poor as we have described the Border chief, and fierce as he certainly was by education and office, it was not often that he was either able or disposed to settle the quarrels of his clansmen in a manner so amicable and expensive. War was then resorted to; and it was the

1 In the year 1600, Archibald Napier, second son of Sir Alexander Napier of Merchiston, was waylaid and assassinated by five of the name of Scott, who had a deadly feud with the unfortunate young man. The present Lord Napier has some curious correspondence between the father and brother of the slain gentleman, respecting the assythement offered by the chief in the name of the murderers to atone the quarrel. The brother seems to have declared for revenge, the father appears rather inclined to accommodate the dispute.

duty of the chief and clan who had sustained the injury to seek revenge by every means in their power, not only against the party who had given the offence, but, in the phrase of the time and country, against all his name, kindred, maintainers, and upholders. On the other hand, the chief and clan to whom the individual belonged who had done the offence, were equally bound in honour, by every means in their power, to protect their clansman, and to retaliate whatever injury the opposite party might inflict in their thirst of vengeance. When two clans were involved in this species of private warfare, which was usually carried on with the most ferocious animosity on both sides, they were said to be at *deadly feud*, and the custom is justly termed by the Scottish parliament most heathenish and barbarous. And the Statute-book expressly states, that the murders, ravage, and daily oppression of the subjects, to the displeasure of God, dishonour of the prince, and devastation of the country, was occasioned partly by the negligence of the landlords and territorial magistrates, within whose jurisdiction the malefactors dwelt, but chiefly by the chieftains and principal leaders of the clans and their branches, who bore deadly quarrel and sought revenge for the hurt or slaughter of any of their "unhappy race," although done in form of justice, or in recovery of stolen goods. "So that," continues the statute, "the said chieftains, principals of branches, and householders, worthily may be esteemed the very authors, fosterers, and maintainers of the wicked deeds of the

vagabonds of their clans or surnames."[1] In these deadly feuds, the chiefs of clans made war, or truce, or final peace with each other, with as much formality, and as little sincerity, as actual monarchs. Some examples of which the reader will find in the account of the private wars between the powerful families of Johnstone and Maxwell, in the end of the sixteenth century, in which each clan lost two successive chieftains. Many battles were fought, and much slaughter committed.[2]

As the chief was expected to protect his followers, in good and evil, from the assaults of their neighbours, and even from the pursuit of justice, the followers and clansmen were expected, on the other hand, to exhibit the deepest marks of devotion to his interest, never to scruple at his commands when alive, and, in case of his death by violence, to avenge him, at whatever risk to themselves. In the year 1511, Sir Robert Kerr, warden of the Middle Marches, was slain at a Border meeting by three Englishmen. Starhed, one of the murderers, fled, it is said, nearly as far south as York, and there lived in private and upon his guard. Yet in this place of security he was surprised and murdered by two of Sir Robert Kerr's followers, who brought his head to their master, by whom, in memorial of their vengeance, it was exposed at the Cross of Edinburgh. These observations may suffice to explain the state of clanship as it existed on the frontier. The cause of the

[1] Statute, 1594, chap. 211.

[2] See *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, vol. ii., p. 133.

system's subsisting so long was its peculiar adaptation for the purposes of war and plunder, which the relative condition of the two kingdoms rendered in later times the constant occupation of the Borderers. This was not always the case, for there was an early period of history when the hostility between the two kingdoms was neither constant nor virulent.

Until the death of Alexander III. of Scotland, and the extinction of the direct line of succession to the crown opened the way to the ambition of Edward I., there were long continued intervals of peace and amity between England and Scotland. The royal families of each country were united by frequent alliances; and as the possession of extensive domains in England, held of the English crown, frequently obliged the kings of Scotland to attend the court of their brother-sovereign, they formed friendships both with the English kings and nobles, which tended to soften the features of hostility when it broke out between the nations. The attachment of Malcolm IV. to Henry II. was so great as to excite the jealousy of his own subjects; and the generosity of Cœur de Lion restored to William of Scotland the pledges of homage which had been extorted from him after his defeat and imprisonment at Alnwick, and converted an impatient vassal into an affectionate and grateful ally. From that period, A. D. 1189, there was an interval of profound peace between the realms for more than a century. During this period, as well as in the preceding reigns, the state of the Border

appears to have been progressively improving. It was there that David I. chose to establish the monastic institutions whose magnificent remains still adorn that country, the Abbeys, namely, of Kelso, Melrose, Jedburgh, and Dryburgh. The choice of spots so near the limits of his kingdom (for his possession of some part of the North of England was but precarious) was, perhaps, dictated by the sound policy of ensuring the cultivation of tracts peculiarly exposed to the ravage of the enemy, by placing them under the sacred protection of the church. In this point of view the foundations completely answered the purpose designed; for it is well argued by Lord Hailes, that, while we are inclined to say with the vulgar that the clergy always chose the best of the land, we forget how much their possessions owed their present appearance to the art and industry of the clergy, and the protection which the ecclesiastical character gave to their tenants and labourers, while the territories of the nobles were burnt and laid waste by invaders. If these advantages are taken into consideration, we shall admire, rather than censure, the munificence of David I., and hesitate to join the opinion of his successor, who, adverting to his character of sanctity, purchased, as he deemed it to have been, by his dilapidation of the royal patrimony, observed, sarcastically, that he had proved a sore saint for the crown.

The settlement of these monasteries contributed, doubtless, not a little to the improvement of the country around them; and the introduction of

many Norman families upon the Border country must also have had its share in introducing regular law and good order. Under the progressive influence of these changes of property, it seems probable that the Celtic system of clanship would have gradually given way, and that the Borderers would have assimilated their customs and manners to those of the more inland parts of Scotland. But the savage and bloody spirit of hostility which arose from Edward the First's usurpation of the crown of Scotland, destroyed in a few years the improvements of ages, and carried the natives of these countries backward in every art but in those which concerned the destruction of the English and each other. The wars which raged through every part of Scotland in the thirteenth century, were urged with peculiar fury on the Borders. Castles were surprised and taken; battles were won and lost; the country was laid waste on all sides, and by all parties: The patriotic Scotch, like the Spaniards of our own time, had no escape from usurped power but by sacrificing the benefits of civilisation, and leading the lives of armed outlaws. The struggle, indeed, terminated in the establishment of national independence; but the immediate effect of the violence which had distinguished it was to occasion Scotland retrograding to a state of barbarism, and to convert the borders of both countries into wildernesses, only inhabited by soldiers and robbers. Many towns, which had begun to arise in the fertile countries of Roxburgh and Berwickshires, were anew ruined. Roxburgh itself, once one of the four principal burghs of Scotland,

was so completely destroyed, that its site is now only remembered and pointed out by tradition.[1]

The mode of warfare adopted by the Scots themselves, however necessary and prudent, was destructive to property, and tended to retard civilisation. They avoided giving pitched battles, and preferred a wasting and protracted war, which might tire out and exhaust the resources of their invaders. They destroyed all the grain and other resources of their own country which might have afforded relief to the Englishmen, and they viewed with great indifference the enemy complete the work of destruction. In the meanwhile, they secured their cattle among the mountains and forests, and either watched an opportunity to attack the invaders with advantage, or, leaving them to work their will in Scotland, burst into England themselves, and retaliated upon the enemy's country the horrors which were exercised in their own.[2]

[1] [Roxburgh (old and new town) was undoubtedly the capital of Scotland, during the reign of David I., and the county town, till it was ruined, by the sad hostilities of the succession war.—CHALMERS' *Caledonia*, vol. ii., p. 111.]

[2] This extraordinary species of warfare astonished the French auxiliaries, who, under John de Vienne, came to the assistance of the Scottish in the year 1384. They beheld with surprise the Scottish army decline combat, and, plunging into the woods, "destroy," says Froissart, "all as they went, and burn towns, villages, and manors, causing all the men, women, and children to retreat with their cattle into the wild forests, where they knew well that the English could not follow them." Then, while an English army ravaged the country of Scotland, and burned the capital, the Scottish forces burst into Northumberland and Cumberland, wasting, slaying, and burning without mercy, until, in the opinion of the French auxiliaries, they had done more damage in the bishoprics of

This ferocious, but uncompromising mode of warfare, had been strongly recommended in the rhymes considered a legacy from Robert Bruce to his successors, and which indeed do, at this very day, comprise the most effectual, and almost the only defensive measures, which can be adopted by a poor and mountainous country, when invaded by the overpowering armies of a wealthy neighbour. The concentration of the national forces in woods, mountains, and difficult passages,—the wasting the open country, so as to deprive the enemy of the supplies they might obtain from it,—sudden attacks from ambushes and by night,—a system of destroying the hostile communications and narrowing their resources, are as distinctly recommended by these homely lines as they were to the Portuguese by the great captain whose conduct and valour achieved their independence. In the following transcript, the modern orthography is preferred :—

" On foot should be all Scottish weir, [1]
By hill and moss themselves to wear ; [2]
Let wood for walls be bow and speir,
That enemies do them no dreire. [3]
In strait places gar [4] keep all store,
And burn the plain land them before ;

Durham and Carlisle than all the towns of Scotland were worth. " So the Frenchmen and Scotts returned into Scotland the same way they came; and when they came into Scotland, they found the country destroyed, but the people did set but little thereby, and said how with three or four poles they would soon set up their houses again, and that they had saved much of their cattle in the woods."—*The Cronycle of* FROISSART, vol. ii., pp. 27, 29.

[1] *Weir*—war.
[2] *Wear*—to defend.
[3] *Dreire*—harm or injury.
[4] *Gar*—cause.

Then shall they pass away in haste,
When that they find naething but waste.
With wiles and wakening on the night,
And meikle noises made on height;
Than shall they turn with great affray
As they were chased with sword away;
This is the counsell and intent
Of good King Robert's testament."

FORDUNI, *Scotichronicon*, vol. ii., p. 232.

It followed, from this devastating system of defensive war, that the Scottish were so far from desiring to cover their borders by building strong places or fortresses, that they pulled them down and destroyed them where they already existed. Buchanan has elegantly turned this systematic destruction of their castles into a compliment to the valour of his countrymen:

Nec fossis et muris patriam sed Marte tueri.

But, without disparaging Scottish valour, the motive of leaving their frontier thus open, seems to have been a consciousness that they were greatly surpassed by the English both in the attack and defence of their strongholds; that if they threw their best warriors into frontier garrisons, they might be there besieged, and reduced either by force or famine; and that the fortresses of which the enemy should thus obtain possession, might afford them the means of maintaining a footing in the country. When, therefore, the Scottish patriots recovered possession of the castles which had fallen into the power of the English, they usually dismantled them. The Good Lord James of Douglas surprised his own castle of Douglas three times, it having been as frequently garrisoned

by the English, and upon each occasion he laid waste and demolished it.[1] The military system of Wallace was on the same principle. And, in fine, with very few exceptions, the strong and extensive fortresses, which had arisen on the Scottish Borders in better times, were levelled with the ground during the wars of the thirteenth century. The ruins of the Castles of Roxburgh, of Jedburgh, and of several others which were thus destroyed, bear a wonderful disproportion in extent to any which were erected in subsequent times. Nay, the Castle of Jedburgh was so strongly and solidly constructed, and the Scottish so unskilful in the art of destruction, even where there was no military opposition, that it was thought it could not be destroyed without such time and labour as would render it necessary to impose a tax of two pennies on every hearth in Scotland to defray the expense. But Duke Robert of Albany, then regent, to shun the unpopularity of this impost, defrayed the charge of the demolition out of the crown revenues.

This continued to be the Scottish defensive system for many ages, and, of course, while it exposed invaders to hardships, loss, and want of subsistence, it reduced the frontiers of their own country, for the time, to a waste desert. Beacons were lighted in such a manner as to signify either the threatened approach, or actual arrival, of the English army. These were maintained at Hume Castle, at the Tower of Edgerhope, or Edgerstane,

[1] [See Appendix to the *Lord of the Isles, note T*, Sir Walter Scott's *Poetical Works*, vol. x., p. 333.]

near the source of the Jed, upon the ridge of the Soltra Hills, at Dunbar, Dunpender (or Trapraine) Law, North Berwick Law, and other eminences; and their light was a signal for the Scottish forces to assemble at Edinburgh and Haddington, abandoning to waste and pillage all the southern counties.[1] Till the very last occasion of hostility between England and Scotland, this mode of defensive war was resorted to in the latter kingdom. Cromwell found the Borders in that desolate situation in his campaign of 1650; and, had it not been for the misjudged zeal of the presbyterian ministers, who urged David Lesley to give battle at Dunbar, he must have made a disastrous and disgraceful retreat.[2]

From this system it followed that most of the Scottish places of strength, even when the abode of great nobles or powerful chiefs, were constructed upon a limited and mean scale. Built usually in some situation of natural strength, and having very thick walls, strongly cemented, they could easily repel the attack of any desultory incursion; but

1 Statute 1455. Chap. 28.

2 "In the march between Mordington and Coppersmith (Cockburn's Path) we saw not any Scotchman in Eyton, and other places that we passed through; but the streets were full of Scotch women, pitiful sorrow creatures, clothed in white flannel, in a very homely manner. Very many of them very much bemoaned their husbands, who, they said, were enforced by the lairds of the towns to gang to the muster. All the men in this town, (Dunbar,) as in other places of this day's march, were fled; and not any to be seen above seven or under seventy years old, but only some few decrepid ones." —*Relation of the Fight at Leith, near Edinburgh, &c. publishea by authority; printed by Ed. Griffin*, 1650, 4to.

they were neither victualled nor capable of receiving garrisons sufficient to defend them, excepting against a sudden assault. The village, which always almost adjoined to the castle, contained the abodes of the retainers, who, upon the summons of the chieftain, took arms either for the defence of the fortress or for giving battle in the field. Of these, the greater part were called "kindly tenants," or "rentallers," deriving the former name from the close and intimate nature of their connexion with the lord of the soil, from whom they held their little possessions by favour rather than bargain; and the latter from the mode in which their right of possession was constituted, by entering their names in their lord's rental-book.[1] Besides

[1] Satchells gives a list of the pensioners thus daily maintained in the family of Buccleuch, and distinguishes the lands which each held for his service:—

"That familie they still were valiant men,
No Baron was better served into Britain;
The Barons of Buckcleugh they keept at their call
Four-and-twenty gentlemen in their hall,
All being of his name and kin,
Each two had a servant to wait on them;
Before supper and dinner most renowned,
The bells rung and the trumpet sounded,
And more than that I do confess,
They kept four-and-twenty pensioners;
Think not I lie, or do me blame,
For the pensioners I can all name;
There's men alive elder than I,
They know if I speak truth or lie.
Ev'ry pensioner a room did gain,
For service done and to be done,
This I'le let the reader understand,
The name of both the men and land,
Which they possess'd it is of truth,
Both from the Lairds and Lords of Buckleugh."[2]

History of the Name of Scott.

[2] [Compare the opening stanzas of the *Lay of the Last Minstrel.*]

this ready militia, the more powerful chiefs maintained in their castle, and as immediate attendants upon their persons, the more active young gentlemen of their clan, selected from the younger brethren of gentlemen of estate, whose descent from the original stock, and immediate dependence upon the chief, rendered them equally zealous and determined adherents. These were recompensed by grants of land, in property or lease, which they stocked with cattle or sheep, as their chief did those which he retained in his own hands.

But the castles which held these garrisons, whether constant or occasional, were not of strength, or at least of extent, at all commensurate with the military power of the chiefs who inhabited them. The ruins of Cessford, or of Branxholm, before the latter was modernized, might be considered as on the largest scale of Scottish Border fortresses, and neither could brook comparison with the baronial castles of English families of far less power and influence.

Hume Castle might be reckoned an exception, from its extent and importance. The French king was at one time required to supply a garrison for it, (Ridpath's *Border Hist.* p. 571,) which shows a determination to defend it to the uttermost. But this fortress commanded and protected Berwickshire, a country which, from its wealth and population, as well as from the strength of the frontier afforded by the Tweed, early lost the wilder and more savage features of the middle and western Borders. Even in this case it was not without great hazard that the Scottish transgressed their

usual rules, by covering this commanding situation with a strong and extensive castle. For Hume Castle was taken by the English after the fatal battle of Pinkie, and again in the year 1570; and being garrisoned by the enemy, afforded, on both occasions, a stronghold from which they were not easily dispossessed.

The castle of Caerlaverock, on the western frontier, protected against the English by its situation, appears also to have approached, in size and splendour of architecture, to the dignity of an English fortress; but this fortress also was repeatedly taken by the invaders. The original castle of Caerlaverock was besieged, taken, and garrisoned by Edward I., in the year 1300. The siege is the subject of a curious French poem, preserved in the British Museum, and published in the Antiquarian Repertory. When recovered by Sir Edward Maxwell, during the wars of Robert Bruce, he dismantled it, according to the policy which we have already noticed. The present castle, built on a scale of unusual size and magnificence by the powerful family of Maxwell, was ruined by the Earl of Sussex in the fatal year 1570. Much of the present ruins belong to the seventeenth century; and the castle owes its state of desolation to the successful arms of the Covenanters in 1640.

The extensive ruins of Bruce's ancient castle, on a lake beside Lochmaben, indicate its extent and strength; and, by the Scottish regulations, particular care was enjoined that it should be kept by a "wise and famous gentleman," with four horsemen in constant attendance, who was to dis-

charge the office of steward-depute of Annandale. But Lochmaben Castle was founded before the bloody wars in the fourteenth century, when the Borders were in a state of comparative civilisation. Most of the other abodes of the south-western barons, as Closeburn, Spedlin's Castle, Hoddom, Lagg, Amisfield, &c., are towers upon the same plan with those already described.

Even the royal castles on the Border boasted little splendour. That of Newark, a favourite hunting-seat of the kings of Scotland, is merely a large and strong tower, surrounded by a wall of defence, or barnkin.[1] The darksome strength and retired situation of the Hermitage Castle made it long a chosen hold of the Earls of Douglas, and the succeeding branch of the house of Angus, who appear to have fortified it, with little attention indeed to architectural beauty, but so as greatly to improve the natural advantages of its wild sequestered situation.[2] After Hermitage fell into the hands of the crown, it seems usually to have been garrisoned with a few hired soldiers, and was the ordinary residence of the Earls of Bothwell during their power on the Border.

The smaller gentlemen, whether heads of branches of clans, or of distinct families, inhabited dwellings upon a still smaller scale, called Peels, or Bastle-houses. These were surrounded by an enclosure, or barnkin, the wall whereof was, according to statute, a yard thick, six yards in height, surrounding

[1] [See *note*, Sir Walter Scott's *Poetical Works*, vol. vi., pp. 44, 45.]

[2] [*Ibid*, vol. iv., p. 241, *et seq.* and *note*, p. 251.]

a space of at least sixty square feet.[1] Within this outer work the laird built his tower, with its projecting battlements, and usually secured the entrance by two doors; the outer of grated iron, the innermost of oak clenched with nails. The apartments were placed directly above each other, accessible only by a narrow "turnpike" stair, easily blocked up or defended. Sometimes, and in the more ancient buildings, the construction was still more rude: There was no stair at all; and the inhabitants ascended by a ladder from one story to another. Smailholme, or Sandiknow Tower, is one of the most perfect specimens of this species of habitation, which was usually situated on the brow of a rock, or the brink of a torrent;[2] and, like the castle of the chief, had adjacent huts for the reception of those who were called upon to act in its defence. The Castle of Bemerside, still the residence of the ancient family of Haig, is a tower of the same kind, and is still inhabited by the proprietor.[3]

Upon a sudden attack from any small incursive party, these strengths, as they were called, afforded good means of defence. Artillery being out of the question, they were usually attacked with bows, or hagbuts, the discharge of which drove the defenders from the loopholes and battlements, while the assailants, heaping together quantities of wetted straw, and setting it on fire, drove the garrison

[1] Statute, 1535.

[2] [See Scott's *Poetical Works*, vol. vii., p. 136, &c., and the note.]

[3] [See an engraving, after Turner, in the recent edition of *Sir Tristrem*.]

from story to story by means of the smoke, and sometimes compelled them to surrender. The mode of defence, by stones, arrows, shot, and scalding water, was equally obvious and simple; and, in ordinary cases, by such means of resistance, joined to the strength of the place, and the military disposition of the inhabitants around, who readily rose "to the fray," a desultory attack was easily repulsed. But when, as often happened, the English entered the frontiers with a regular army, supplied with artillery, the lairds usually took to the woods or mountains, with their more active and mounted followers, and left their habitations to the fate of war,[1] which could seldom do any permanent damage to buildings of such rude and massive construction, as could neither be effectually ruined by fire nor thrown down by force. Hence it is no uncommon circumstance to observe, that the same castles are, in the course of a few years, repeatedly stated to be destroyed in the annals of English invasion. Where, however, it was determined in the English councils to make the Scottish frontiers feel the sword and firebrand, the scale of mischief was immense, and embraced whole districts, while the military inhabitants of the plundered country, so soon as the burst of fury

[1] On such occasions it sometimes happened that a few retainers were left as *enfans perdus*, without the means of escape, to hold the tower out to the uttermost, and thus protect the retreat of the laird. This appears from the account given by Patten of the siege of the towers of Anderwick and Thornton by the Lord Protector Somerset, which also contains a minute account of the mode of attacking and defending a Scottish Peel or Bastle-house.—See Appendix, No I.

was over, set themselves about to regain, by repeated forays, on a smaller scale indeed, but equally formidable from their frequency, a compensation for the property which they had been compelled to abandon to the overpowering force of the invaders. The two most dreadful invasions commemorated in Scottish annals, were the great inroads of the Earl of Hertford, in the end of Henry the Eighth's reign, and that of the Earl of Sussex, in the twelfth year of Queen Elizabeth.

While such was the state of the landholder, and even of the noble, upon the Borders, it is natural to enquire into the condition of the towns along the Scottish frontier. It appears they were numerous, and, considering the very precarious state of security, full of inhabitants. Dumfries, Jedburgh, and Selkirk, were those of principal note. They were under the same mode of government, by their own elective magistrates, as the other free boroughs of Scotland, and, on many occasions, maintained their freedom and franchises against the powerful barons in the neighbourhood, with whom they were frequently at feud.[1] Besides

[1] There was a memorable feud betwixt the Laird of Fairnihirst and the town of Jedburgh, accompanied with some curious circumstances. The chief was attached to the interest of Queen Mary, the burghers of Jedburgh espoused that of King James VI. When a pursuivant, under the authority of the Queen, was sent to proclaim that every thing was null which had been done against her, during her imprisonment in Lochleven, the provost commanded him to descend from the cross, and, says Bannatyne, "caused him eat his letters, and thereafter loosed down his points, and gave him his wages on his bare buttocks with a bridle, threatening him

these intestine divisions, they had to be constantly on their guard against the inhabitants of the opposite frontier, to whom their wealth (such as it was) afforded great temptation. It was acquired chiefly by smuggling; for, as the most rigorous laws in both countries prohibited all mercantile intercourse upon the Borders under high pains, a great contraband trade, both for cattle, horses, salt, fish, and other merchandise, existed upon the frontiers, even till the union of the kingdoms, when most of the southern boroughs of Scotland experienced a great declension, both in wealth and inhabitants, from its being discontinued. Every free burgher was by his tenure a soldier, and obliged, not only to keep watch and ward for the defence of the town, but to march under his magistrates, deacons of craft, &c., to join the king's banner when lawfully summoned. They also attended in order of battle and well armed at the warden meetings and other places of public rendezvous on the Borders, had their peculiar gathering-words and war-cries, and appear often to have behaved with distinguished gallantry.[1]

that if ever he came again he should lose his life."—BANNATYNE'S *Journal*, p. 243. In revenge of this insult, and of other points of quarrel, Fairnyhirst made prisoners, and hanged ten of the citizens of Jedburgh, and destroyed with fire the whole stock of provisions which they had laid up for the winter.

[1] The citizens of Jedburgh were so distinguished for the use of arms, that the battle-axe, or species of partisan, which they commonly used, was called a Jeddart-staff, after the name of the burgh. Their bravery turned the fate of the day at the skirmish of the Reedswair, one of the last fought

The Border towns were usually strong by situation, as Dumfries upon the Nith, and Jedburgh upon the river of the same name, and were almost always surrounded by some rude sort of fortification, or wall, with gates, or, as they were called in Scottish, ports. But even when these defences were forced by a superior enemy, the contest was often maintained with obstinacy in the town itself, where the height of the houses and narrowness of the streets afforded to brave and determined men the means of resistance, or at least of vengeance. Most of the towns and even villages contained, besides the houses of the poorer inhabitants, bastle-houses, or towers, surrounded with walls, like those which we have described as the habitations of the landed proprietors. The ruins of these are to be seen in most Border villages of antiquity. In that of Darnwick, near Melrose, there is one belonging to a family called Fisher, almost entire. There is another at Jedburgh, which Queen Mary is said to have lodged in after her ill-fated expedition to visit Bothwell at Hermitage Castle.[1] These towers were either the abode of the wealthier citizens, or of the neighbouring gentry, who occasionally dwelt within the burgh, and they furnished admirable posts for the annoyance of an enemy, even after they had possessed themselves of the town. Lessudden, a populous village, when burned by Sir Ralph Evers

upon the Borders, and their *slogan*, or warcry, is mentioned in the old ballad which celebrates that event—

> Then rose the slogan with a shout,
> "Fye to it, Tynedale"—"Jedburgh's here."

[1] [See *Border Minstrelsy*, Introduction, vol. i., p. 134.]

in 1544, contained no less than sixteen strong bastle-houses; and Jedburgh, when taken and burned by the Earl of Surrey, contained six of these strong-holds, with many good houses besides, was twice as large as the town of Berwick, and could have accommodated a garrison of a thousand cavalry. The defence of these towns was very obstinate, the people themselves pulling down the thatch of their houses, and burning it in the streets to stop the progress of their enemies; and the military spirit of the Borderers was such as calls forth the following very handsome compliment from the generous Surrey: —"I assure your Grace (Henry VIII.) that I found the Scots at this time the boldest men and the hottest that ever I saw any nation, and all the *journee* upon all parts of the army they kept us with such continual skirmishes that I never beheld the like. If they could assemble forty thousand as good men as the fifteen hundred or two thousand I saw, it would be a hard encounter to meet them"[1]

If we turn our eyes from the frontiers of Scotland to those of England, we shall behold a very different scene, indicating, even in these remote provinces, the superior wealth and civilisation of the English nation, with that attention to defence which was the natural consequence of their having something of value to defend. The central marches, indeed, and the extreme verge of the frontier in every direction, excepting upon the east, were inhabited by wild clans as lawless as their northern

[1] Cotton MSS. Calig. B. iv. fol. 29.

neighbours, resembling them in manners and customs, inhabiting similar strongholds, and subsisting, like them, by rapine. The towers of Thirlwall, upon the river Tippal, of Fenwick, of Widdrington, and others, exhibit the same rude strength and scanty limits with those of the Scottish Border chieftains. But these were not, as in Scotland, the abode of the great nobles, but rather of leaders of an inferior rank. Wherever the mountains receded, arose chains of castles of magnificent structure, great extent, and fortified with all the art of the age, belonging to those powerful barons whose names hold so high a rank in English history. The great house of Clifford of Cumberland alone possessed, exclusive of inferior strongholds, the great and extensive castles of Appleby, Brough, Brougham, Pendragon, and Skipton, each of which formed a lordly residence, as may yet be seen from their majestic ruins. The possessions of the great house of Percy were fortified with equal strength. Warkworth, Alnwick, Bamborough, and Cockermouth, all castles of great baronial splendour and strength, besides others in the interior of the country, show their wealth and power. Raby Castle, still inhabited, attests the magnificence of the great Nevilles, Earls of Westmoreland; and the lowering strength of Naworth shows the power of the Dacres. All these, and many others which might be mentioned, are so superior to edifices of the same kind in Scotland, as to verify the boast, that there was many a dog-kennel in England to which the tower of a Scottish Borderer was not to be com-

pared.[1] Yet when Naworth or Brougham Castles are compared with the magnificence of Warwick and of Kenilworth, their savage strength, their triple rows of dungeons, the few and small windows which open to the outside, the length and complication of secret and subterranean passages, show that they are rather to be held limitary fortresses for curbing the doubtful allegiance of the Borders, and the incursions of the Scottish, than the abodes of feudal hospitality and baronial splendour.

The towns along the English frontier were, in like manner, much better secured against incursions than those of the opposite Borders. The necessity of this had been early taught them. In the reign of Edward I., a wealthy burgess of Newcastle was made prisoner in his own house by a party of Scottish moss-troopers, carried into Scotland, and compelled to ransom himself. This compelled the inhabitants to fortify that city.[2] The strength and importance of Berwick, often won and lost during the fourteenth century, induced the English to bestow such expense and skill in fortifying it, that, after the year 1482, it remained as a gate between the kingdoms, barred against the Scottish, but through which the English could at pleasure make irruption. A strong garrison was maintained in that city, ready at all times for service; and, to have kept Berwick-upon-Tweed,

[1] See *Cabala*, p. 160.

[2] *Chorographia, or a Survey of Newcastle-upon-Tyne*, republished by the Antiquarian Society of that city.

was of itself a sufficient praise for a military man, and sums up, in a minstrel ballad, the character of Harry Hotspur himself.[1] When garrisons of regular troops were lodged, as was usually the case, in the royal castle of Norham, and Lord Grey's baronial castle of Wark, with smaller parties in those of Etal, Ford, Cornhill, and Twizell, the course of the Tweed, where it divides the kingdoms, was well protected from invasion; and the necessary siege of one or other of this chain of fortresses usually found the Scottish arms such employment, that, ere they could advance into the interior of Northumberland, the array of England was collected and combined for the defence of her frontier. Carlisle, strong and skilfully fortified, having besides a castle of great antiquity and strength, was to the English west marches, what Berwick was on the east, a place of arms and a rallying point. The crown appears frequently to have maintained garrisons there, besides the retinue which was assigned to the wardens, as also at Askerton in Bewcastle, Naworth, and other places

[1] In the old song of the battle of Otterbourne, Hotspur is thus eulogized:

> "Sir Henry Percye in the New Castell lay,
> I tell ye withouten drede,
> He had been a march-man all his dayes,
> And kept Berwicke upon Tweed."

Sir Ralph Evers, a Border hero of later date, who was slain in the battle of Ancrum Moor, receives a similar compliment from the minstrel by whom he was celebrated—

> "And now he has in keeping the town of Berwicke,
> The town was ne'er so well keepit I wot;
> He maintain'd law and order along the Border,
> And ever was ready to prikke the Scot."

of strength. Hexham, in the centre of the Border line, was also fortified, so that if any considerable body of the Scottish forces should penetrate through the wastes of Reedsdale and Tyndale, they might still find an obstacle in their passage.

But although these precautions served to protect the English frontier from those extensive scenes of inroad and desolation which their arms sometimes inflicted on Scotland, and in so far afforded them defence, yet the evils of the desultory war carried on by small parties of the enemy, who made sudden irruptions into particular districts, laid all waste, and returned loaded with spoil, were not to be guarded against. If the waste committed by the English armies was more widely extended and generally inflicted, the continual and unceasing *raids* of the Scottish Borderers were scarcely less destructive. The English, if better defended by castles and garrisons, afforded, from the superior wealth of the country, stronger temptation to their free-booting neighbours, and gain is a surer spur to adventures of this kind than mere revenge. The powerful Earl of Northumberland, writing to Henry VIII., complains, that from his house at Warkworth he sees the horizon enlightened by the burning hamlets which the Scottish marauders had pillaged and fired. Such were the frequent signals of invasion—

> ——————— "at whose sight
> So oft the yeomen had in days of yore,
> Cursing his perilous tenure, wound the horn;
> And warden from the castle tower rung out
> The loud alarm bell, heard far and wide."
>
> *Madoc*, p. 359.

The tenure of cornage, alluded to by the poet in these beautiful lines, was well known on the English Borders, as well as on the Marches of Wales, to which the verses refer. The smaller barons usually held their lands and towers for the service of winding a horn, to intimate the approach of a hostile party. An alarm of this sort, and its consequences, Æneas Silvius witnessed on his passing through Northumberland in his road to Scotland, in the character of a legate, in the year 1448.

"There is a river, (the Tweed,) which spreading itself from a high mountain, parts the two kingdoms; Eneas having crossed this in a boat, and arriving about sunset at a large village, went to the house of a peasant, and there supped with the priest of the place and his host. The table was plentifully spread with large quantities of poultry and geese, but neither wine nor bread was to be found there, and all the people of the town, both men and women, flocked about him as to some new sight; and as we gaze at Negroes or Indians, so did they stare at Eneas, asking the priest where he came from, what he came about, and whether he was a Christian. Eneas, understanding the difficulties he must expect on this journey, had taken care to provide himself at a certain monastery with some loaves, and a measure of red wine, at sight of which they were seized with greater astonishment, having never seen wine or white bread. Women with child came up to the table with their husbands, and after handling the bread and smelling the wine, begged some of each, so that it was impossible to avoid distributing the whole among

them. The supper lasted till the 2d hour of the night; the priest and host, with all the men and children, made the best of their way off, and left Eneas. They said they were going to a tower a great way off for fear of the Scots, who, when the tide was out, would come over the river and plunder; nor could they with all his intreaties by any means be prevailed on to take Eneas with them, nor any of the women, though many of them were young and handsome, for they think them in no danger from an enemy, not considering violence offered to women as any harm. Eneas therefore remained alone for them with two servants and a guide, and 100 women, who made a circle round the fire, and sat the rest of the night without sleeping, dressing hemp and chatting with the interpreter. Night was now far advanced, when a great noise was heard by the barking of dogs, and screaming of the geese. All the women made the best of their way off, the guide getting away with the rest, and there was as much confusion as if the enemy was at hand. Eneas thought it more prudent to wait the event in his bedroom, (which happened to be a stable,) apprehending if he went out he might mistake his way and be robbed by the first he met. And soon after the women came back with the interpreter, and reported there was no danger, for it was a party of friends, and not of enemies, that were come."

To prevent these distressing inroads, the English warden, Lord Wharton, established a line of communication along the whole line of the Border, from Berwick to Carlisle, from east to west, with

setters and searchers, sleuth-hounds, and watchers by day and night.[1] Such fords as could not be conveniently guarded, were, to the number of thirty-nine, directed to be stopped and destroyed, meadows and pastures were ordered to be enclosed, that their fences might oppose some obstacle to the passage of marauders, and narrow passes by land were appointed to be blocked up or rendered unpassable. All these precautions, while they showed the extent of the evil, did not, however anxiously considered and carefully enforced, produce, in any remarkable degree, the good effects which might have been expected. Indeed, the state of the population on either side of the frontier had become such, that to prevent these constant and reciprocal incursions was absolutely impossible, without a total change in their manners and habits of life. And this leads us to take a brief review of the character and manners of the Borderers on either side.

Lesley, bishop of Ross, has given us a curious chapter on the manners of the Borderers of Scotland, a translation whereof the reader will find in the Appendix, No. II. Contrary to the custom of the rest of Scotland, they almost always acted as light-horsemen, and used small active horses accustomed to traverse morasses, in which other cavalry would have been swallowed up. Their hardy mode of life made them indifferent to danger, and careless about the ordinary accommodations of life. The uncertainty of reaping the fruits of their

[1] See Articles devised at Newcastle in the 6th of Edward VI. Border Laws, Appendix.

labour, deterred them from all the labours of cultivation; their mountains and glens afforded pasturage for the cattle and horses, and when these were driven off by the enemy, they supplied the loss by reciprocal depredation. Living under chiefs by whom this predatory warfare was countenanced, and sometimes headed, they appear to have had little knowledge of the light in which their actions were regarded by the legislature; and the various statutes and regulations made against their incursions, remained in most cases a dead letter. It did indeed frequently happen that the kings, or governors of Scotland, when the disorders upon the Border reached to a certain height, marched against those districts with an overpowering force, seized on the persons of the chiefs, and sent them to distant prisons in the centre of the kingdom, and executed, without mercy, the inferior captains and leaders. Thus, in the year 1529, a memorable era for this sort of expeditious justice, James V., having first committed to ward the Earl of Bothwell, the Lords Home and Maxwell, the Lairds of Buccleuch, Fairnihirst, Johnstone, Polwarth, Dolphington, and other chiefs of clans, marched through the Borders with about eight thousand men, and seizing upon the chief leaders of the moss-troopers, who seem not to have been aware that they had any reason to expect harm at their sovereign's hands, executed them without mercy. Besides the celebrated Johnie Armstrong of Gilnockie, to whom a considerable part of the English frontier paid black-mail, or protection-money, the names of Piers Cockburn of Henderland, Adam Scott of

Tushielaw, called the King of the Border, and other marauders of note, are recorded as having suffered on this occasion.[1] And although this, and other examples of severity, had the effect for the time, as the Scottish phrase is, of "dantoning the thieves of the Borders, and making the rush-bush keep the cow," yet this course not only deprived the kingdom of the assistance of many brave men, who were usually the first to endure or repel the brunt of invasion, but it also diminished the affections of those who remained; and a curious and middle state of relation appears to have taken place between the Borderers on each side, who, as they were never at absolute peace with each other during the cessation of national hostilities, seem, in like manner, to have shunned engaging in violent and sanguinary conflicts, even during the time of war. The English Borderers, who were in the same manner held aliens to the civilized part of the country, insomuch that, by the regulations of the corporation of Newcastle, no burgess could take to his apprentice a youth from the dales of Reed or Tyne, made common cause with those of Scotland, the allegiance of both to their proper country was much loosened; the dalesmen on either side seem to have considered themselves in many respects as a separate people, having interests of their own, distinct from, and often hostile to, that of the country to which they were nominal subjects. This gave rise to some singular features in their history.

[1] [See *Tales of a Grandfather*, 1*st series*, vol. iii., p. 28, *et seq.*, and, at more length, the case of Armstrong, *Border Minstrelsy*, vol. i., p. 392.]

In the first place, this indifference to the national cause rendered it the same thing to the Borderers whether they preyed upon the opposing frontier, or on their own countrymen. The men of Tynedale and Reedsdale, in particular, appear to have been more frequently tempted by the rich vales of the Bishopric of Durham, and other districts which lay to the southward, than by the rude desolation of the Scottish hills. Their wild manners are thus described in the *Chorographia, or Survey of Newcastle*, first published in 1549.

"There is in many dales, the chief are Tinedale and Reedsdale, a country that William the Conqueror did not subdue, retaining to this day the ancient laws and customs (according to the county of Kent) whereby the lands of the father is equally divided at his death amongst all his sonnes. These Highlanders are famous for thieving; they are all bred up and live by theft. They come down from these dales into the low countries, and carry away horses and cattell so cunningly, that it will be hard for any to get them or their cattell, except they be acquainted with some master thiefe, who for some mony (which they call saufey-mony) may help them to their stoln goods, or deceive them. There is many every yeare brought in of them into the goale of Newcastle, and at the Assises are condemned and hanged, sometimes twenty or thirty. They forfeit not their lands, (according to the tenure in gavelkind,) the father to the bough, the son to the plough. The people of this countrey hath had one barbarous custome amongst them; if any two be displeased, they expect no lawye, but bang it out bravely, one and his kindred against the other and his; they will subject themselves to no justice, but in an inhumane and barbarous manner fight and kill one another; they run together in clangs (clans) as they terme it, or names. This fighting they call their feids, or deadly feids, a word so barbarous that I cannot express it in any other tongue. Of late, since the union of both kingdoms, this heathenesh bloody custom is repressed, and good laws made against such barbarous and unchristian misdemeanours, and fightings.

The Scottish Borderers seem to have been, in all respects, as little amenable to the laws of their country, and as little disposed to respect the rights of their countrymen as the Dalesmen of Northumberland. Their depredations not only wasted the opposite frontier of England, but extended through the more civilized parts of Scotland, and even into Lothian itself; and it is singular enough, that a Scottish lord chancellor seems to have had no more effectual mode of taking vengeance on them than by writing a poem of exprobation.[1] They entered readily into any of the schemes of the English Borderers, and we find them contributing their numbers to swell the army with which the unfortunate Earls of Westmoreland and Northumberland entered Liddesdale in the twelfth year of Queen Elizabeth, as well as upon other occasions, when public commotion gave hope of plunder. But their allegiance hung much more loosely about them than this would imply; for not only did they join the English Borderers in their exploits against the English government, but upon any turn of affairs which was favourable to the arms of England, they readily took assurance, as it is called, or allied themselves with that kingdom, and assisted them with their forces in laying waste

1 See Maitland's Complaint against the Thieves of Liddesdale, in Pinkerton's *Scottish Poems;* and a copy, somewhat different, in *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, vol. i., pp. 164 and 256.

> "Of Liddesdale, the common thieves
> Sae pertly steilis now and reives
> That nane may keep
> Horse, nolt, or sheep,
> Nor yet dare sleep
> For their mischievis," &c. &c.

their native country. This was particularly the case with the Borderers who inhabited the *Debateable Land*, as it was called, a considerable portion of ground upon the west marches, the allegiance of whose inhabitants was claimed by both parties, and rendered to neither. They were outlawed to both nations, and readily made incursions upon either, as circumstances afforded the best prospect of plunder.[1] The inhabitants of Liddesdale, also comprehending the martial clans of Armstrong, Elliot, and others, were apt, on an emergency, to assume the red cross, and for the time became English subjects. They had indeed this to plead for their conduct, that the sovereigns of Scotland had repeatedly abandoned them to the vengeance of English retaliation, on account of hostilities against that country, which their own monarchs were unable to punish.[2] These clans, with the Rutherfords,

[1] The Debateable Land (a perpetual source of contention between the kingdoms) was a small tract of ground, inhabited by the most desperate outlaws of both nations, lying between the rivers Sark and Esk. In 1552, it was divided by commissioners of both nations, the upper or more western part being assigned to Scotland, and the lower portion to England, in all time coming.

[2] By a convention, dated at Berwick, in the year 1528, it is declared lawful for the King of England to proceed by letters of marque, authorizing his wardens and other officers to proceed against the inhabitants of Liddesdale to their slaughter, burning, hership, robbing, reiving, despoiling, and destruction, till full redress was obtained of the wrongs complained of. But it is provided, that the English shall not besiege the house or castle of Hermitage, or appropriate any part of Liddesdale, or accept of the homage of any of its inhabitants being Scotchmen by birth. The same singular mode of coercion was to be competent to the King of Scotland for the injuries committed by the clans of Leven, and

Crossers, Turnbulls, and others, were the principal instruments of the devastation committed in Scotland in the year 1445. They expiated this fault, however, by another piece of treachery towards their English allies, when seeing the day turn against them at Ancrum-moor, these assured Borderers, to the number of 700 men, suddenly flung away their red crosses, and, joining their countrymen, made great and pitiless slaughter among the flying invaders.

It followed, as another consequence of the relations which the Borderers held with each other, that, as they were but wavering in allegiance to their own country, so their hostilities upon the other, though constant and unremitted, were seldom marked by a sanguinary character. The very unremitted nature of the predatory war between them gradually introduced rules, by which it was modified and softened in its features. Their incursions were marked with the desire of spoil, rather than that of slaughter. Indeed, bloodshed was the rather avoided, as it uniformly demanded revenge, and occasioned a deadly feud between two clans; whereas the abstraction of property was only considered as a trivial provocation. As we have noticed the fury with which they revenged the former injury, we may here give an instance of the care which they took to avoid it. When

inhabitants of the tract of country between the Crissep, the Liddell, and that stream. Each monarch might prevent this hostile mode of procedure against his subjects, by offered redress and satisfaction, by the 11th of January, 1528-9, or within forty days thereafter.—RYMER'S *Fœdera*, p. 276.

the discomfited Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland entered Liddesdale, after the dispersion of their forces in the twelfth of Queen Elizabeth, they were escorted by Black Ormiston, and other Borderers. Martin Elliot of the Preakin Tower, who was attached to the Regent Murray, raised his clan to intercept their passage; but when both parties had met, and dismounted from their horses to fight out their quarrel, Elliot said to Ormiston, "he would be sorry to enter into deadly feud with him by bloodshed, but he would charge him and the rest before the Regent for keeping of the rebels; and if he did not put them off the country the next day, he would do his worst against them;" and thus they parted on a sort of composition.[1] Patten, in describing the English Borderers, gives many insinuations that their hostilities against their Scottish neighbours were not of a resolved or desperate nature. They wore, he observes, handkerchiefs on their arms, and letters embroidered on their caps, which, he hints, enabled them to maintain a collusive correspondence with the Scottish, who bore similar cognizances. He said they might be sometimes observed speaking familiarly to the Scottish prickers, within less than spear's length; and when they saw themselves noticed, they began to charge each other, but so far from serious was their skirmish, that it rather resembled countrymen playing at bar, or novices in a fencing-school. Lastly, he affirms that they attended much more to making

[1] *Cabala.*

prisoners than to fighting, so that few brought home less than one captive, and many six or seven. Their captains and gentlemen, this censor admits, are men of good service and approved prowess; but he seems to doubt the fidelity of the northern prickers who served under them.

Yet these men, who might thus be said to bear but dubious allegiance to their country, were, of all others, the most true of faith to whatever they had pledged their individual word. If it happened that any of them broke his troth, he who had sustained the wrong displayed, at the first public meeting upon the Borders, a glove on the point of a lance, and proclaimed him a perjured and mansworn traitor. This was accounted an insult to the whole clan to which the culprit belonged. If his crime was manifest, there were instances of his being put to death by his kinsmen; but if the accusation was unfounded, the stain upon the honour of the clan was accounted equal to the slaughter of one of its members, and, like that, could only be expiated by deadly feud. Under the terrors of this penalty, the degree of trust that might be reposed in the most desperate of the Border outlaws, is described by Robert Constable, in his account of an interview with the banished Earl of Westmoreland and his unfortunate followers. They desired to get back into England, but were unwilling to trust their fortune without sure guides. "I promised," said Constable, "to get them two guides that would not care to steale, and yet they would not bewray any man that trusts in them for all the gold in Scotland or France.

They are my guides and outlaws; if they would betray me they might get their pardons, and cause me to be hanged, but I have tried them ere this."[1]

This strict observance of pledged faith tended much to soften the rigours of war; for when a Borderer made a prisoner, he esteemed it wholly unnecessary to lead him into actual captivity or confinement. He simply accepted his word to be a true prisoner, and named a time and place where he expected him to come to treat about his ransom. If they were able to agree, a term was usually assigned for the payment, and security given; if not, the prisoner surrendered himself to the discretion of his captor. But where the interest of both parties pointed so strongly towards the necessity of mutual accommodation, it rarely happened that they did not agree upon terms. Thus, even in the encounters of these rude warriors on either side, the nations maintained the character of honour, courage, and generosity assigned to them by Froissart. "Englishmen on the one party, and Scotsmen on the other party, are good men of war; for when they meet, there is a hard fight without sparing; there is no hoo (*i. e.* cessation for parley) between them, as long as spears, swords, axes, or daggers, will endure; but they lay on each upon other, and when they be well beaten, and that the one party hath obtained the victory, they then glorify so in their deeds of arms, and are so joyful, that such as be taken they shall be ransomed ere they go out of the field; so that

[1] Sadler's Letters, vol. ii.

shortly each of them is so content with other, that at their departing courteously they will say, 'God thank you.' But in fighting one with another, there is no play, nor sparing."[1]

Of the other qualities and habits of the Borderers we are much left to form our own conjectures. That they were a people of some accomplishment, fond of the legends of their own exploits, and of their own rude poetry and music, is proved by the remains still preserved of both. They were skilful antiquaries, according to Roger North, in whatever concerned their own bounds. Lesley gives them the praise of great and artful eloquence when reduced to plead for their lives; also that they were temperate in food and liquors, and rarely tasted those of an intoxicating quality. Their females caught the warlike spirit of the country, and appear often to have mingled in battle. Fair Maiden Lilliard, whose grave is still pointed out upon the field of battle at Ancram-moor, called, from her name, Lilliard's Edge, seems to have been a heroine of this description.[2] And Hollinshed records them at the conflict fought near Naworth, A. D. 1570. between Leonard Dacres and Lord Hunsdon; the former had in his company "many desperate women, who there gave the adventure of their lives, and fought right stoutly." This is a change in the habits of the other sex which can only be produced by early and daily familiarity with scenes of hazard, blood, and death. The

[1] Berner's Froissart, Edit. 1812, vol. ii., p. 396.

[2] [See notes to the *Battle of Ancram Moor—Border Minstrelsy*, vol. iv., p. 199.]

Borderers, however, merited the devoted attachment of their wives, if, as we learn, one principal use of the wealth they obtained by plunder was to bestow it in ornamenting the persons of their partners.

It may be easily supposed, that men living in so rude a state of society, had little religion, however well they might be stored with superstition. They never told their beads, according to Lesley, with such devotion as when they were setting out upon a marauding party, and expected a good booty as the recompense of their devotions. The various religious houses, which the piety or the superstition of an earlier age had founded in these provinces, gradually ceased to overawe, by their sanctity, the spirits of the invaders; and in the history of the mutual incursions of the two hostile nations, we read repeatedly of their being destroyed and laid waste. Thus the administration of religious rites became irregular and unusual in these wild districts. Of this negligence some traces still remain. The churches on the English border are scantily endowed, and many of them are ruinous. In some parishes there is no house for the incumbent to inhabit, and in others no church for divine service. But these are only the scars of ancient wounds; for in former times the condition of these countries, as to spiritual matters, was more extraordinary and lamentable. In the dales of Esk, Euse, and Liddell, there were no churchmen for the ordinary celebration of the rites of the church. A monk from Melrose, called, from the porteous or breviary which he wore in his breast, a *book-a-bosom*, visited

these forlorn regions once a-year, and solemnized marriages and baptisms. This is said to have given rise to a custom called by tradition, *hand-fasting*, by which a loving couple, too impatient to wait the tardy arrival of this priest, consented to live as man and wife in the interim.[1] Each had the privilege, without loss of character, to draw back from the engagement, if, upon the arrival of the holy father, they did not think proper to legitimate their cohabitation according to the rites of the church. But the party retreating from the union was obliged to maintain the child, or children, if any had been the fruits of their union.

It would seem that the opposite valleys of Redesdale and Tynedale were better supplied with persons (such as they were) who took upon them the character of churchmen. There is extant a curious pastoral monition of Richard Fox, Bishop of Durham, dated 1498, in which, after setting forth the various enormities of theft, robbery, rapine, and depredation, committed by the dalesmen of the Reed and Tyne, and the neighbouring district, not only without shame and compunction, but as the ordinary and proper business of their lives, after stating that they were encouraged in these enormities by the king's officers of justice, and patronised either for kindred's or name's sake, or for the lucre of gain, by the powerful and noble of these districts, the prelate proceeds to describe a sort of ghostly comforters and abettors who were found among them, irregular and

[1] [See *The Monastery — Waverley Novels*, vol. xix., p. 110.]

dissolute churchmen suspended from their holy office for misconduct, or lying under the sentence of excommunication, so ignorant of letters, that they did not even understand the service of the church which they had recited for years, and with them laymen, never ordained, who yet took upon themselves the sacred character of the priesthood. These men, proceeds the monition, dressed in tattered, foul, and sordid vestments, not only unfit for the ministers of Heaven, but even for decent society among men, presume and take upon them, not only in hallowed and dedicated places, but in such as are profane, interdicted, unholy, and defaced by ruins, to administer the rites and sacraments of the church to the thieves, robbers, murderers, and depredators before mentioned, and that without exhorting them to restitution or repentance, expressly contrary to the rules of the church, and to the great danger of precious souls, and scandal of Christianity. The Bishop instructs his suffragans to direct against the robbers and their abettors, whether spiritual or temporal, his pastoral monition to restitution and repentance, to be followed by the thunders of excommunication in case it were contemned by the offenders. It would seem several of the Borderers had accordingly been excommunicated; for, by a rescript, dated at Norham Castle, 5th September, 1498, the same prelate releases from the spiritual sentence certain persons of the clans of Charleton, Robson, Tod, Hunter and others, who had professed penitence for their misdeeds, and submitted, in all humility, to his

paternal chastisement. The penance annexed to their release from spiritual censures was of a singular kind, but illustrates their ordinary costume and habits of life. They are required to renounce the use of the *jack* and head-piece, and to ride upon no horse which shall exceed, in ordinary estimation, the sum of six shillings and eight pence. Moreover, they are enjoined, when they shall enter any church, chapel, or cemetery in the territory of Redesdale or Tynedale, to lay aside, upon their entrance, every offensive weapon exceeding one cubit in length, and to hold speech with no one while within these hallowed precincts, excepting the curate or ministering priest of the said church or chapel, all under penalty of the greater excommunication. Mr Surtees justly observes, that the reclaiming of these Borderers must be ascribed to the personal influence of this able and worthy prelate; but there is ample reason to believe that no radical cure was wrought either in freebooters at large, or in the manners of those irregular and uncanonical churchmen, who, attending them as Friar Tuck is said to have done upon Robin Hood, partook in their spoils, and mingled with the relics of barbarism the rites and ceremonies of the Christian church.[1] The injunction of laying aside offensive weapons, and keeping silence in the church and its precincts, was to prevent the sacred

[1] See the *History of Durham*, by Mr Surtees, p. 62. Also the *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, vol. i., p. 274, where the record of the excommunication and release is printed at length, from the communication of that accurate and indefatigable antiquary.

place from becoming the scene of those bloody quarrels, which usually occurred whenever or wherever the members of clans, between which a deadly feud existed, chanced to meet together. How late the savage customs which rendered such regulations necessary, continued to last among the Northumbrians is evident from some passages in the Life of the truly pious and Christian teacher, Bernard Gilpin, who having a pastoral charge in those wild countries, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, laboured unremittingly to soften and civilize the yet wilder manners of the inhabitants.

The biographer of this venerable man, after stating the fierce usage of deadly feud which often engaged two clans in much bloodshed, on account of some accidental quarrel, proceeds thus:—

"It happened that a quarrel of this kind was on foot when Mr Gilpin was at Rothbury, in those parts. During the two or three first days of his preaching, the contending parties observed some decorum, and never appeared at church together; at length, however, they met. One party had been early at church, and just as Mr Gilpin began his sermon, the other entered. They stood not long silent. Inflamed at the sight of each other, they began to clash their weapons, for they were all armed with javelins and swords, and mutually approach. Awed, however, by the sacredness of the place, the tumult in some degree ceased. Mr Gilpin proceeded, when again the combatants began to brandish their weapons and draw towards each other. As a fray seemed near, Mr Gilpin stepped from the pulpit, went between them, and addressed the leaders, put an end to the quarrel for the present, but could not effect an entire reconciliation. They promised him, however, that, till the sermon was over, they would make no more disturbance. He then went again into the pulpit, and spent the rest of the time in endeavouring to make them ashamed of what they had done. His behaviour and discourse affected them so much, that at his farther entreaty, they promised to forbear all acts of hostility while

he continued in the country. And so much respected was he among them, that whosoever was in fear of his enemy, used to resort where Mr Gilpin was, esteeming his presence the best protection.

"One Sunday morning, coming to a church in those parts before the people were assembled, he observed a glove hanging up, and was informed by the sexton that it was meant as a challenge to any one that should take it down. Mr Gilpin ordered the sexton to reach it him; but upon his utterly refusing to touch it, he took it down himself, and put it in his breast. When the people were assembled, he went into the pulpit, and before he concluded his sermon, took occasion to rebuke them severely for these inhuman challenges. 'I hear,' said he, 'that one among you hath hanged up a glove even in this sacred place, threatening to fight any one who taketh it down; see, I have taken it down;' and pulling out the glove, he held it up to the congregation, and then showed them how unsuitable such savage practices were to the profession of Christianity, using such persuasives to mutual love, as he thought would most affect them."—*Life of Bernard Gilpin*, 1753, p. 178.

The venerable preacher had his reward, for even the freebooter who stole his horses, returned them as soon as he understood to whom they belonged, not doubting that the foul fiend would have carried him off bodily, had he wilfully injured Bernard Gilpin. But it was long ere the effects of the northern apostle's precepts brought forth in that rude country fruits meet for repentance.

Leaving the manners of the Borderers, it is now proper to notice the measures of policy adopted for exercising, in some sort, the royal authority in districts which so many circumstances combined to render lawless; and that whether for the protection of each nation against the aggressions of the other during peace, or for repelling more open invasion during the time of war, or for regulating

the conduct and appeasing the feuds of the inhabitants amongst themselves.

As every thing was military upon the Borders, those important duties were intrusted to officers of high rank, holding special commissions from the crown of either country, and entitled wardens, or guardians of the marches. There were sometimes two, sometimes three in number on each side, for the division of the Borders into east, west, and middle marches, did not prevent the middle marches being occasionally put under the charge of the same warden who governed those on the east or west. The kings of Scotland, compelled by circumstances to yield to the great nobles and powerful chiefs whatever boons they chose to exact of them, usually deposited the charge of warden with some nobleman or chieftain who possessed great personal weight and influence in the districts submitted to his jurisdiction. It is needless to point out the impolicy of this conduct, since the chiefs thus invested with high powers and jurisdiction were often the private encouragers of those disorders which it was their business, as wardens, to have suppressed, and hence their authority was only used to oppress their private enemies, while they connived at the misconduct of their own clansmen and allies. But this was the effect of the weakness, rather than of the blindness, of the Scottish sovereigns. Even the timid Albany, regent during the minority of James V., saw the evil, and endeavoured to secure impartial administration of justice on the frontiers, by naming a gallant French knight, Anthony D'Arcy Sieur De La

Bastie, to the wardenry of the east marches. But the family of Home being incensed to see the office conferred on a stranger which they were wont to consider as proper to the head of their own house, in defiance of the royal authority, Home of Wedderburn assailed and murdered the warden, cut off his head, knitted it to the saddlebow by the long locks, and afterwards exposed it upon the battlements of Home Castle. The issue of this experiment was not therefore such as to recommend its repetition.[1] Accordingly, the names of the barons who for the time possessed most influence on the Border, are usually found on the Scottish commissions. The Earls of Douglas almost always added this title to the other marks of their extensive power. The Earls of Angus frequently exercised the authority of warden of one or other division of the marches, and could often excite mutiny and disorder when the rival house of Arran, or any other, was intruded into an office which they held peculiarly their own right. At a later period, the Earls of Home, or Lords of Cessford, were usually wardens of the east march; Earls of Bothwell, or the Lords of Buccleuch and Fairniherst, of the middle, which usually, though not uniformly, comprehended the separate office of keeper of Liddesdale; and the rival families of Maxwell and Johnstone, or the Lords Herries, were wardens of the west march. Yet even when the truncheon of warden was consigned to a baron of extensive power and following on the frontiers, he seems to

[1] [See the *Introduction to Border Minstrelsy*, vol. i., p. 109.]

have thought that the royal commission, added to his own natural authority, was insufficient to overawe the turbulent Borderers, and bonds of alliance and submission were, in many cases, procured from the principal chiefs, agreeing to respect and enforce the royal authority in the person of the warden; an expedient which only serves to prove how feeble was the influence of the crown, and which implied in it this evil, that the chiefs who thus voluntarily agreed to support the imperfect authority of the warden, expected that it should not be over strictly exerted against those under their immediate protection. Neither was it less precarious than impolitic, for such bonds were, among men of a fiery and jealous disposition, apt to be broken through on the slightest occasion.

It was another, and yet more dangerous consequence of lodging the office of warden in the hands of the Border chieftains, that they appear, without any scruple, to have employed it less for the preservation of the public peace, than for inflicting vengeance upon their own private enemies. If the warden was engaged in deadly feud or private war with the chief of another name, he failed not to display against him the royal banner, and to proceed against him as a rebel to the crown, a conduct for which pretexts were seldom wanting. Thus, in the year 1593, Lord Maxwell, then warden of the west marches, assembled the whole strength of that part of the Border, marched against the Lord of Johnstone, and entered Annandale, with displayed banner as the king's lieutenant, with the purpose of utterly erazing and

ruining that clan, which had so long rivalled his own in courage and enterprise, if not in numbers and power. The Johnstones, by the assistance of their allies the Scotts, and other friendly clans, gave the Maxwells a severe defeat, in which the warden was struck from his horse, mutilated of his hand, and then slain.[1] And although the king took it hardly, according to Spottiswoode, that his warden, a nobleman bearing his authority, should be thus cut off, yet he found himself unable, in the circumstances of the country, to exact any vengeance for the insult. This is a remarkable instance, among many, of the warden's using the royal name to serve his own private purpose, and of the slight respect in which his authority was held upon such occasions.

The Scottish wardens were allowed by the crown forage and provisions for their retinue, which consisted of a guard of horsemen, by whom they were constantly attended; these were levied from the royal domains on the Borders. They had also a proportion of the "unlaws," or fines and forfeits imposed in their warden courts, and, no doubt, had other modes of converting their authority to their own advantage, besides the opportunities their situation afforded them of extending their power and influence. The abodes of the Scottish wardens were generally their own castles on the frontiers, such as we have described them to be; and the large trees, which are still to be seen in the neighbourhood of these baronial

[1] [See *The Lads of Wamphray—Border Minstrelsy*, vol. ii., p. 148, and *Lord Maxwell's Goodnight*, ib. p. 133.]

strongholds, served for the ready execution of justice or revenge on such malefactors as they chose to doom to death. There is, or was, a very large ash-tree near the ruins of Cessford Castle, said, by tradition, to have been often used for this purpose.

Until the English monarchy acquired some degree of power and consistency, the northern nobles usually, as in the sister country, extorted from the crown the office of wardenry, which was then held by the potent Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, the Lords Clifford, Dacre, and other chiefs of power on the Border. But, from the reign of Henry VIII. downward, and more especially after most of the great Northumbrian families were destroyed in the great northern insurrection of 1569-70, a different line of policy was observed. Instead of conferring commissions of wardenry on the great Border families, whose wealth, extensive influence, and remote situation, already rendered them but too independent of the crown, those offices were bestowed upon men of political and military skill, such as Sir Ralph Sadler, Sir James Crofts, Sir Robert Carey, and others, the immediate dependents of the sovereign himself, who, supported by liberal allowances from the treasury, and by considerable bodies of regular troops,[1] were not afraid, if the discharge of their

1 From a memorial concerning Border service, in the papers of Sir Ralph Sadler, it appears that the allowance of the captain-general of Berwick was twenty shillings per day, and the pay of the captains, soldiers, and others of the garrison in ordinary, amounted to L.2400; and when extraordinary forces were stationed there, to more than twice that sum.

office called for it, to give offence even to the most powerful of the provincial nobility.[1]

For their residence, the warden of the east marches appears often to have resided at Alnwick, although Norham Castle, once belonging to the Bishops of Durham, afterwards to the crown, is recommended both by Lord Wharton and Sir Ralph Sadler[2] as the fittest place for his abode. But the office of warden of the east marches being frequently united with the government of Berwick, that most important frontier town was often the warden's place of abode. Upon the middle marches, the castle of Harbottell, originally the seat of the Umfravilles, and afterwards, by marriage, that of the Tailbois, being vested in the crown by forfeiture, was judged a commodious and suitable residence for the warden. The government of Carlisle being usually combined with the wardenry of the western marches of England, the strong castle of that town furnished the warden with a suitable residence. Lord Scroope of Bolton, who held both these important offices, long resided there, and made considerable additions to the fortifications without, and accommodations within the castle. But Lord William Howard occupied his baronial castle of Naworth when he had the same commissions.

The warden of the east marches, with his personal attendance of fifteen gentlemen, was allowed L.16 : 16 : 8 for his weekly charges, and all allowances to inferior officers were upon the same scale.—SADLER's *State Papers*, vol. ii., p. 276.

[1] See Sadler's *State Papers*, vol. ii., p. 97, concerning disputes betwixt him and the Earl of Northumberland.

[2] See *Border Laws*, p. 344, and Sadler, vol ii., p. 283.

To ensure a general superintendence of these important offices, a lord-warden-general was sometimes nominated; but this office became less necessary, because, in time of war, there was usually a lieutenant appointed for the management of all military affairs, and during peace the general affairs of the Borders fell under the cognizance of the Lord President of the Council of the North.

The wardens had under them deputy-wardens, and warden-serjeants, (popularly called land-serjeants,) upon whose address and activity the quiet of the country much depended. The captains of the various royal garrisons also received orders from them; and the keeper of Tynedale, an unruly district, which required a coercive magistracy of its own, was under the command of the warden of the middle marches.

The duties committed to the charge of the wardens were of a twofold nature, as they regarded the maintenance of law and good order amongst the inhabitants of their jurisdiction themselves, and as they concerned the exterior relations betwixt them and the opposite frontier.

In the first capacity, besides their power of control and ministerial administration, both as head stewards of all the crown tenements and manors within their jurisdiction, and as intromitting with all fines and penalties, their judicial authority was very extensive. They held courts for punishment of high treason and felony, which the English Border laws classed under the following heads:—1. The aiding and abetting of any Scottishman, by communing, appointment, or otherwise, to rob,

burn, or steal, within the realm of England. 2. The accompanying, personally, any Scottishman, while perpetrating such offences. 3. The harbouring, concealing, or affording guidance and protection to him after the fact. 4. The supplying Scottishmen with arms and artillery, as jacks, splents, brigantines, coats of plate, bills, halberds, battle-axes, bows and arrows, spears, darts, guns, as serpentines, half-haggs, harquibusses, currys, cullivers, handguns, or daggers, without special license of the lord-warden. 5. The selling of bread and corn of any kind, or of dressed leather, iron, or other appurtenances belonging to armour, without special license. 6. The selling of horses, mares, nags, or geldings to Scottishmen, without license as aforesaid. 7. The breach of truce, by killing or assaulting subjects and liege-men of Scotland. 8. The assaulting any Scottishman having a regular pass or safe-conduct. 9. In time of war the giving tidings to the Scottish of any exploit intended against them by the warden or his officers. 10. The conveying coined money, silver or gold, also plate or bullion, into Scotland, above the value of forty shillings at one time. 11. The betraying (in time of war) the counsel of any other Englishman tending to the annoyance of Scotland, in malice to the party, and for his own private advantage. 12. The forging the coin of the realm. 13. The making appointment and holding communication with Scottishmen, or intermarrying with a Scottish woman, without license of the wardens, and the raising no fray against them as in duty bound. 14. The

receiving of Scottish pilgrims with their property without license of the wardens. 15. The failing to keep the watches appointed for defence of the country. 16. The neglecting to raise in arms to the fray, or alarm raised by the wardens or watches upon the approach of public danger. 17. The receiving and harbouring Scottish fugitives exiled from their own country for misdemeanours. 18. The having falsely and unjustly *fould* (*i. e.* found true and relevant) the bill of any Scotchman against an Englishman, or the having borne false witness on such matters. 19. The having interrupted or stopped any Englishman pursuing for recovering of his stolen goods. 20. The dismissing any Scottish offender taken red-hand (*i. e.* in the manner) without special license of the lord-warden. 21. The paying of blackmail, or protection money, whether to English or Scottish man.

All these were points of indictment in the warden courts; and the number and nature of the prohibitions they imply show the anxiety of the English government to prevent all intercourse, as far as possible, between the natives of the two kingdoms. Most of these offences, if not all, amounted to march-treason. The accused persons were tried by a jury, and, if found guilty, suffered death by decapitation; but with the marauders of either country, the wardens used much less ceremony, and hanged them frequently, and in great numbers, without any process of law whatever. This was a very ordinary consummation, if we can believe a story told of Lord William Howard of Naworth.

While busied deeply with his studies, he was suddenly disturbed by an officer who came to ask his commands concerning the disposal of several moss-troopers who had been just made prisoners. Displeased at the interruption, the warden answered heedlessly and angrily, "Hang them, in the devil's name;" but, when he laid aside his book, his surprise was not little, and his regret considerable, to find that his orders had been literally fulfilled.

The Scottish wardens do not appear to have held warden-courts, doubtless because the territorial jurisdictions of sheriffdoms, stewartries, baillaries, and so forth, which belonged to the great families by hereditary right, and the privileges of which they jealously watched, would have been narrowed by their doing so. Besides, the Scottish hereditary judges possessed the dangerous and inconvenient power of *repledging*, as their law terms it, that is, reclaiming any accused person from courts of a co-ordinate jurisdiction, to try him by their feudal authority. It is true, the judge exercising this privilege was obliged to give security for doing justice in the premises himself; but whether his object was that of acquittal, or condemnation, his situation gave him easy means of accomplishing either without much risk of challenge. But if the Scottish wardens were more slow to hold formal courts than the English, they were not behind them in the summary execution of those offenders whom they seized upon. The ordinary proverb of Jedburgh Justice, where men were said to be

hanged first, and tried afterwards, appears to have taken its rise from these hasty proceedings.[1]

The pleasure of hunting these outlaws to their fastnesses was, to some of the warlike barons who held the office of warden, its own best reward. Godscroft says it was so peculiarly suited to the disposition of Archibald, the IXth Earl of Angus, that it might be called his proper element. He used to profess that he had as much delight in hunting a thief as others in chasing a hare; and that it was as natural to him as any other pastime or exercise was to another man. Yet the chase of this Border Nimrod (whose game was man) was by no means uniformly successful; and he was foiled on many occasions by the impracticability of the country, and the cunning of the outlaws who harboured in it.[2]

[1] There is a similar English proverb concerning Lydford:—

> "I oft have heard of Lydford law,
> Where in the morn men hang and draw,
> And sit in judgment after."
>
> BROWN'S *Poems*.

[2] "He made only one road against the outlawed thieues of the name of Armestrang (most of them) after the king was gone home, who had been present at the casting down of their houses. He pursued them into the Tarrass Moss, which was one of their greatest strengths, and whither no host or companies had ever been known to have followed them before, and in which they did confide much, because of the straightness of the ground. He used great diligence and sufficient industry, but the success was not answerable either to his desire or other men's expectation. Neither did he forget to keep his intention close and secret, acquainting none of the people of that country therewithall, until he was ready to march. Then directing one Jordan, of Applegirth, to go

The Border marauders had every motive to exert their faculties for the purpose of escape; for, once seized upon, their doom was sharp and short. The mode of punishment was either by hanging, or drowning.[1] The next tree, or the deepest pool of the nearest stream, was indifferently used on these occasions. Many moss-troopers are said to have been drowned in a deep eddy of the Jed near Jedburgh. And, in fine, the little ceremony used

to the other side, whither he knew they behoved to flee, he sent with him one of his especiall followers, whom he knew to be well affected to the service, to see that he did his duty. He himself, with the army, came openly and directly to the place of their abode, that they, fleeing from him, might fall into the hands of Applegirth, and his companie, who were come in sufficient good time, before the army could be seen to that passage which they were sent to keep. But the birds were all flown, and there was nothing left but the empty nest, having (no question) had some inkling and intelligence hereof; but it could not be tried by whom the notice had been given them. In the retreat they shew themselves, and rode about to intercept and catch such as might happen incircumspectly to straggle from the army; and they failed very narrowly to have attrapped William Douglas of Ively, a young gentleman of my lord's family, for which incircumspection he was soundly chide by him, as having thereby hazarded his own person, and his lord's honour."—GODSCROFT's *History of the House of Douglas*, folio, Edin. p. 430.

[1] Drowning is a very old mode of punishment in Scotland; and in Galloway there were pits of great depth appropriated to that punishment, still called murder-holes, out of which human bones have occasionally been taken in great quantities. This points out the proper interpretation of the right of pit and gallows, (in law Latin, *fossa et furca*,) which has, less probably, been supposed the right of imprisoning in the pit or dungeon, than that of hanging. But the meanest baron possessed the right of imprisonment. The real meaning is, the right of inflicting death either by hanging or drowning.

on these occasions added another feature to the reckless and careless character of the Borderers, who were thus accustomed to part with life with as little form as civilized men change their garments.

The wardens had it also in their power to determine many civil questions concerning the right of property violently usurped by oppression, or recovered from the hands of marauders. The mode of application seems to have been by petition. Thus, the complaint of Isabel Wetherel to Sadler, when warden of the middle marches, sets forth, that she had been found entitled to possession of a certain tenement in Bassenden, by order of the Earl of Northumberland, the former warden, and that the bailiff of the liberty still refused to execute the warrant in her favour. Another "poor oratrix," the Widow Fenwick, states in her supplication, that besides certain persons formerly named, she now charges some of her neighbours of the town of Wooler, whom before she had been afraid to accuse, with stealing her three cows, and prays relief in the premises. Again, John of Gilrie states, that he had made a bargain with William Archer for twenty bolls of barley, at a certain price; that Archer had only delivered ten of the said bolls, and had arrested the petitioner's horses in payment thereof, instead of implementing his bargain by delivery of the remainder. All these petitions pray for letters of charge to be directed by the warden against the parties complained upon, for answer or redress. They serve to show the complicated and

mixed nature of the warden's jurisdiction, which thus seems to have admitted civil suits of a very trifling kind.

But the principal part of the warden's duty respected his transactions in the opposite kingdom in the time both of war and peace. During the time of war, he was captain-general within his wardenry, with full power to call out musters of all the fencible men betwixt the age of sixteen and sixty, duly armed and mounted according to their rank and condition, for defending the territory, or, if necessary, for invading that of the enemy. He directed, or led in person, all hostile enterprises against the enemy's country; and it was his duty, upon such occasions, to cause to be observed the ancient rules and customs of the marches, which may be thus summed up.

1. Intercourse with the enemy was prohibited. 2. He who left his company during the time of the expedition was liable to the punishment of a traitor. 3. It was appointed that all should alight and fight on foot, except those commanded by the general to act as cavalry; he who remained on horseback, without such orders, forfeited his spoil and prisoners, two parts to the king, and one to the general. 4. No man was to disturb those appointed to array the host. 5. If a soldier followed the chase on a horse belonging to his comrade, the owner of the horse enjoyed half the booty; and if he fled upon such horse, it was to be delivered to the sheriff as a waif on his return home, under pain of treason. 6. He that left the host after victory, though for the purpose of securing his prisoner, lost

his ransom. If any one slew another's prisoner, he was liable to pay his ransom; or, in failure of his ability to do so, was sentenced to death. In general, it was found to be the use of the marches, that every man might take as many prisoners as he could secure, exchanging tokens with them that they might afterwards know each other. 7. Any one accused of seizing his comrade's prisoner was obliged to find security in the hands of the warden-serjeant. Disputed prisoners were to be placed in the hands of the warden; and the party found ultimately wrong, to be amerced in a fine of ten pounds. 8. Relates to the evidence in the case of such dispute. He who could bring his own countrymen in evidence, of whatever quality, was preferred as the true captor; failing of this mode of proof, recourse was had to the prisoner's oath. 9. No prisoner of such rank as to lead an hundred men, was either to be dismissed upon security, or ransomed, for the space of fifteen days, without leave of the warden. 10. He who dismounted a prisoner was entitled to half of his ransom. 11. Whoever detected a traitor was entitled to the reward of one hundred shillings; whoever aided his escape, suffered the pain of death. 12. Relates to the firing of the beacons in Scotland; the stewards of Annandale and Kirkcudbright, were liable in the fine of one merk for each default in that matter. 13. He who did not join the array of the country upon the signal of the beacon-lights, or who left it during the continuance of the English invasion without lawful excuse, his goods were forfeited, and his person placed at the warden's will. 14. In

case of any Englishman being taken within Scotland, he was not suffered to depart under any safe conduct save that of the king or warden; and a similar protection was necessary to enable him to return and treat of his ransom. If this was neglected, he became the prisoner of whatever Scottishman happened to seize him. 15. Any Scottishman dismissing his prisoner, when a host was collected either to enter England or defend against invasion, was punished as a traitor. 16. In the partition of spoil, two portions were allowed to each bowman. 17. Whoever deserted his commander and comrades, and abode not in the field to the uttermost, his goods were forfeited, and his person liable to the punishment of a traitor. 18. Whoever bereft his comrade of horse, spoil, or prisoner, was liable in the pains of treason, if he did not make restitution after the right of property became known to him.

These military regulations were arranged by William Earl of Douglas, by the advice of the most experienced marchmen, in the year 1468.[1]

[1] The exordium of these regulations is remarkable. It runs thus:—"Be it remembered, that on the 18th day of December, 1468, Earl William Douglas assembled the whole lords, freeholders, and eldest Borderers that best knowledge had, at the College of Linclouden, and there he caused those lords and Borderers bodily to be sworn, the holy Gospel touched, that they justly and truly, after their cunning, should decrete, decern, deliver, and put in order and writing, the statutes, ordinances, and uses of marche that were ordained in Black Archibald of Douglas' days, and Archibald his son's days, in time of warfare; and they came again to him advisedly with these statutes and ordinances which were in time of warfare

But it appears that they were adopted by the English with the necessary alterations, for a copy of them is found in the Manuscript of Mr Bell, the accurate and laborious warden-clerk of the western marches of England, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. At least, they are so well suited to the genius of the country and age, that there can be no doubt that they express the general spirit of the military enactments on both sides of the Border.

We must not omit to state, that as the wardens of the marches had it in charge to conduct the war between the countries, so they had also power of concluding truces with the opposite warden for their own jurisdictions. Such an indenture, entered into between "the noble lords and mighty," Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, and Archibald Douglas, Lord of Galloway, at the water of Esk, beside Solway, on the 15th March, 1323-4, not only concludes a truce between their bounds on each side, but declares, "That if any great power of either country shall prepare to invade the other, each of the said lords shall do what they can to hinder it, and if they cannot prevent it, they

before. The said Earl William seeing the statutes in writing decreed and delivered by the said lords and Borderers, thought them right speedful and profitable to the Borderers; the which statutes, ordinances, and points of warfare he took, and the whole lords and Borderers he caused bodily to be sworn that they should maintain and supply him at their goodly power, to do the law upon those that should break the statutes underwritten. Also the said Earl William, and lords and eldest Borderers, made certain points to be treason in time of warfare to be used, which were no treason before his time, but to be treason in his time, and in all time coming."

shall give the other party fifteen days' notice, and shall themselves abstain from riding with the host, and shall do all in their power, without fraud or guile, to keep the aggressors out of their bounds. Intimation of the rupture of the truce was to be given by a certain term, at the Chapel of Salom, or Solway. All prisoners on either side were to be freely delivered. If any single freebooter committed theft in breach of the covenant, he was to be hanged or beheaded; if a company were concerned in the delict, one should be put to death, and the others amerced in double the value of their spoil." This indenture rather resembles a treaty between two independent princes, than an agreement between the crown officers of the west marches of England and Scotland. Something, doubtless, is to be ascribed to the great power of the Percy and the Douglas, who could, unquestionably, make their authority go much farther than chieftains of less weight could have done, though holding the same ostensible commission. Still, however, the powers of the wardens in waging war, or concluding truces, were of an extensive and unlimited nature.

In time of peace, the warden had the more delicate task of at the same time maintaining the amicable relations betwixt the two countries, and of preventing or retaliating the various grievances and encroachments committed by the Borderers of the opposite kingdom upon the frontiers under his rule.

The most constant, and almost unremitted subject of complaint, was the continual incursions of

the moss-troopers upon both sides. This species of injury early required the redress of international laws or customs. For example, although the right of the native of the invaded country to protect his property against the robber could not be denied, and although it was equally his inherent privilege to pursue the marauders with such force as he could assemble, and recover the plunder if he could overtake them within the bounds of the kingdom which they had invaded, yet it was a question of national law, how far he was entitled to continue pursuit in a hostile manner into the territory of the sister country, and there to recover his property by force. At the same time, it was not to be expected that the intervention of a small river, or of an imaginary line, should be a protection for the robbers and their booty, against the just resentment of the party injured, while in the very act of hot pursuit. The Border Laws, therefore, allowed the party plundered not only to follow his goods upon the spur, and enter the opposite kingdom for recovery thereof, without license or safe conduct, but even to do the like, at any time within six days after his sustaining the injury, providing always he went straight to some honest man of good fame inhabiting the marches which he had thus entered, and declared to him the cause of his coming, inviting him to attend him and witness his conduct. The wardens of either realm, or those duly authorized by them, were entitled to pursue fugitives or offenders into the precincts of the neighbouring realm, by what was called the *hot-trod*. This pursuit was maintained with a

lighted piece of turf carried on a spear, with hue and cry, bugle-horn, and blood-hound, that all might be aware of the purpose of the party. If any native of the country thus entered intercepted the party or their blood-hound in such *hot-trod*, he was liable to be billed, or indicted at the next day of truce, and delivered up to the warden whom he had offended. It was, however, recommended to the pursuers of the *hot-trod* to stop at the nearest town of the realm whose frontiers they had thus passed, and give declaration of the purpose of the chase, and require the inhabitants to go along to witness his procedure. If the pursuers did unlawful damage within the opposite realm, they were liable to be delivered to the warden thereof for condign punishment.

But these provisions were only calculated to remedy such evils as befell *de recenti*, since to have sought reparation at their own hand and by their own strength for such as were of older date, would have made the Borders a constant scene of uproar, retaliation, and bloodshed. Some course of justice, therefore, was to be fallen upon, by which justice might be done to those who had sustained wrong from the depredators of the opposite country, by means more regular and less hazardous than the ready measures of forcible retaliation.

The first regulations laid down on this subject were conformable to the ideas of that military age, which referred all matters difficult of instant proof, to the judgment of God in single combat. Eleven knights of Northumberland, and as many of the Scottish east marches, with the Sheriff of North-

umberland on the one side, and of Roxburgh and Berwick on the other, met in the 33d of Henry III. anno 1249. These martial formalists made some regulations for recovery of debts due by those of the one kingdom to the other, and for the re-delivery of fugitive bondsmen.[1] But they unanimously declared that every Scottishman accused of having committed any crime in England, of which he could offer to purge himself by the combat, could only be summoned to answer at fixed places on the marches. Also, that all persons, of whatever rank or degree, dwelling between Totness, in Cornwall, and Caithness, in Scotland, might be appealed to battle on the marches, excepting only the sovereign, and the Bishops of St Andrews and Dunkeld.[2] Goods alleged to be stolen from England might be sued for by the owner in the court of the Scottish lord within whose bounds they were discovered; but if the accused party denied the charge, there was no other alternative but the combat. Yet, if the accused did not feel bold in his innocence, or determined in his denial, he might quit himself of the charge, without the risk of combat, in the following singular manner. He was to bring the stolen ox, horse, cow, or other animal, to the brink of the river Tweed or Esk, where they form the frontier line, and drive it into the stream. If the animal escaped alive to the other kingdom, he had no farther trouble in the matter; but if it

[1] It is the Scottish copy of Indenture which exists. That of England must have been *mutatis mutandis*.

[2] Churchmen of corresponding dignity in England must have been unquestionably admitted to the same privilege.

was drowned before it reached the middle stream, then he was condemned liable to the plaintiff for its estimable value. Lastly, these experienced men of war decreed, by a sweeping clause, that no inhabitant of either kingdom could prove his property in any goods actually possessed by an inhabitant of the other, unless by the *body of a man*, that is, by entering the lists either personally, or by a delegated champion.

Every dispute between the inhabitants, on either side, was, therefore, decided by personal duel, and even churchmen were bound to combat by proxy. The clergy of England numbered this among the grievances which they reported to the legate Otho, in the year 1237. They state, that by an abuse of a mandate of the kings of England and Scotland, not only simple clerks, but even abbots and priors within the diocese of Carlisle, were, on the challenge of any one of the kingdom of Scotland, compelled to undertake, with lance and sword, and otherwise armed, the combat, which was called *aera*,[1] to be fought on the frontiers of the two kingdoms; so that the abbot or prior, of whatever order, was obliged to have a champion, and, in case of his defeat, was subjected to the penalty of one overcome in the appeal to God, as in our

[1] *Aera*, or *aerea*, a word of uncertain meaning; and, so far as I know, only occurring in this sense in the present passage. It may allude to the area or enclosed space within which the combatants fought. *Aerea*, and *area*, are explained by Du Cange and in the Supplement, as synonymous, and as meaning an enclosed space, neither cultivated nor ploughed. The circular enclosure near Penrith, called King Arthur's Round Table, was probably an area of this kind.

own time, continues the remonstrance, was experienced by the Prior of Lideley.[1]

When priests were not excused, the combats among the laity must have been very numerous. But in later times, the appeal to combat was less universally admitted, and the state of confusion and depredation on the Borders increasing, as we have observed, after the usurpation of Scotland by Edward I., rendered it necessary to seek for other modes of checking theft than that by which the true man was compelled to expose his life in combat with the robber. It became, therefore, a principal part of the warden's duty, when that duty was conscientiously performed, during the time of peace to maintain a regular and friendly intercourse with those on the opposite side, both for preventing and punishing all disorders committed by the lawless on either territory. But besides these communications, it was a principal point of their commission, that the wardens on either side should hold days of truce, or of march, as frequently as could be made convenient, in which, with great solemnity, they enquired into and remedied the offences complained of by the subjects of either realm.

The wardens, on these occasions, took the field attended by the lords, knights, esquires, and men of name within their jurisdictions, all in their best arms, and well mounted. The two troops paused on the frontiers of both kingdoms, until they had exchanged assurance for observing and keeping

[1] *Annales Burtonenses*, apud Gale, vol. i., p. 292.

the peace from sunrise to sunset. The two wardens then met in great form, mutually embraced each other, and, surrounded by those of the best rank in their marches, they proceeded to examine the *bills*, or complaints, tendered on either side. If the persons accused were judged guilty, the bills were to be *filed*, or *fouled;* if the complaint was dismissed, the bill was said to be *cleansed*. Where doubt occurred, the question of cleansing or fouling a bill was tried either by the honour of the wardens, or by a jury of six English and six Scottish gentlemen,[1] mutually chosen, or by a vower-public, that is, a referee belonging to the country of the party accused, and mutually chosen by the plaintiff and the defendant. In some cases, the accused was permitted to exculpate himself by oath, which, terrible as its denunciations were, did not always prevent perjury.[2] In like manner, the plaintiff, or party who preferred the bill, was bound to make oath to the estimated value of his goods.[3]

[1] The jurors took the following oath: "You shall clean no bills worthy to be fouled, you shall foul no bills worthy to be cleaned, but shall do that what appeareth with truth, for the maintenance of the peace, and suppressing of attempts. So help you God."—*M.S. of* Mr Bell, *Warden Clerk, quoted in Introduction to* Nicolson's *History of Cumberland and Westmoreland.*

[2] The following were the terms of this oath for excusing a bill, as it was termed:—"You shall swear by heaven above you, hell beneath you, by your part of paradise, by all that God made in six days and seven nights, and by God himself, you are whart out sackless of art, part, way, witting, ridd, kenning, having, or recetting of any of the goods and cattels named in this bill. So help you God."—Bell's *Manuscript, as above.*

[3] The oath of estimation was as follows: "You shall leile

Perjury, in such cases, was punished by imprisonment and infamy; and if the plaintiff over-rated the goods he had lost, the amount might be taxed by a jury of both nations.

With respect to the offenders against whom bills were presented, it was the duty of the warden to have them in custody, in readiness for their answer; and in case the bills were fouled, he was bound to deliver them up to the opposite warden, by whom they were imprisoned until they paid a *single and two doubles*, that is to say, treble the value of the estimated goods in the bill. To produce these offenders was generally the most difficult part of the warden's duty. He could not keep them in confinement until the day of truce; for, independently that they were sometimes persons of power and rank, their numbers were too great to be detained in custody. The wardens, therefore, usually took bonds from the chief, kinsmen, or allies of the accused party, binding him or them to enter him prisoner within the iron gate of the warden's castle, or else to make him forthcoming when called for. He against whom a bill was thrice fouled, was liable to the penalty of death. If the offender endeavoured to rescue himself after being lawfully delivered over to the opposite warden, he was liable to the punishment of death, or otherwise, at the warden's pleasure, as being guilty of a breach of the assurance.

price make, and trueth say, what your goods were worth at the time of their taking, to have been bought and sold in a market all at one time, and that you know no other recovery but this. So help you God."—*Ibid.*

The extent of the mutual damage sustained by both kingdoms being thus ascertained, a list, in the form of an account-current, was made up by enumerating all the bills fouled on each side, and the value was summed by striking a balance against the country whose depredators had been most active. It seems probable the extremity of the legal satisfaction was seldom exacted or obtained. The resentment of the depredators and of their kinsmen was dreaded; the common usage took away the natural abhorrence of the crime; plunder was a privilege which each party assumed in their turn; and as it often happened that the same person against whom a bill was fouled for one fact, had himself been a sufferer, and was a plaintiff in a charge preferred against others, it is probable that some extra-judicial settlement often took the matter out of the warden court. Nay, it frequently happened, when enormities had gone to great extent during any particular time of misrule, that a veil was dropped over the past, and satisfaction exacted from neither party. At other times, when the crowns were determined strictly to maintain the relations of amity with each other, the course of justice was more severely enforced. Men of high rank, the chiefs of clans, and others responsible, by their situation and authority, for the conduct of those under them, were sometimes delivered up to be kept in ward in the opposite kingdom until the misdeeds of their deputies and dependents were atoned for by payment of the valuation and fines. But it does not appear that the wardens could proceed to attach these persons on their simple autho-

rity. Their delivery seems to have followed in consequence of an agreement to that purpose, by special commissioners, vested with full powers from both crowns. To such commissioners also belonged the power of making new laws and enactments on the Border, the wardens being limited by the existing rules of march.

Besides depredations by robbery on each side, the wardens, at their days of truce, were wont to demand and receive satisfaction for other encroachments, such as sowing or pasturing by the natives of one kingdom within the territories of the other, offences subject to be fouled by bill, and punished by mulct, and the more frequent invasion for the purpose of cutting wood in the forests of the opposite frontier, or hunting, hawking, and disporting in the same without license asked or received. These encroachments, which will remind the reader of Chevy Chase, often gave rise to scuffles, and even to bloodshed.[1]

[1] Such an event was prevented by the prudence of Sir Robert Carey. "The next summer after, I fell into a cumbersome trouble, but it was not in the nature of thieves or malefactors. There had been an ancient custom of the Borderers, when they were at quiet, for the opposite Border to send to the warden of the middle march to desire leave that they might come into the Borders of England and hunt with their greyhounds for deer towards the end of summer, which was never denied them. But towards the end of Sir John Foster's government, when he grew very old and weak, they took boldness on them, and without leave asking, would come into England, and hunt at their pleasure, and stay their own time; and when they were a-hunting, their servants would come with carts, and cut down as much wood as every one thought would serve his turn, and carry it away to their houses in Scotland. Sir John's imbecillity and weakness

When the business of the meeting was over, the wardens retired, after taking a courteous leave of each other; and it was a custom of the march, that,

occasioned them to continue this misdemeanour some four or five years together, before he left his office. And after my Lord Euers had the office, he was so vexed and troubled with the disorders of the country, as all the time he remained there, he had no leisure to think of so small a business, and to redress it; so that now they began to hold it lawful to come and go at their pleasures without leave asking. The first summer I entered, they did the like. The Armstrongs kept me so on work that I had no time to redress it; but having over-mastered them, and the whole march being brought to a good stay and quietness, the beginning of next summer, I wrote to Fernihirst, the warden over against me, to desire him to acquaint the gentlemen of his march, that I was no way unwilling to hinder them of their accustomed sports to hunt in England as they ever had done, but withal I would not by my default dishonour the queen and myself, to give them more liberty than was fitting. I prayed him, therefore, to let them know, that if they would, according to the ancient custom, send to me for leave, they should have all the contentment I could give them; if otherwise they would continue their wonted course, I would do my best to hinder them.

"Notwithstanding this letter, within a month after, they came and hunted as they used to do without leave, and cut down wood, and carried it away. I wrote again to the warden, and plainly told him, I would not suffer one other affront, but if they came again without leave they should dearly *aby*[1] it. For all this they would not be warned; but, towards the end of the summer, they came again to their wonted sports. I had taken order to have present word brought me, which was done. I sent my two deputies with all the speed they could make, and they took along with them such gentlemen as were in their way, with my forty horse, and about one of the clock they came up to them, and set upon them; some hurt was done; but I gave especial orders they should do as little hurt, and shed as little blood, as possibly they could. They observed my command, only they

[1] Suffer for it

before dismissing the gentlemen who attended them, each warden demanded of the most respectable and experienced Borderers, their opinion of the business of the day, and requested them to say whether the rules of the march had been observed, and justice equally distributed.

When these days of march-truce were held regularly, and justice punctually administered, the Borders were comparatively but little disturbed; and the wardens on both sides were usually instructed, from their several courts, not to insist too particularly on points of mere form or of difficult discussion, but to leave them for discussion by special commissioners.

But although these regulations were perhaps as wise as the case admitted, yet the union of the opposite wardens, so necessary to preserve the peace of the frontier, was always of precarious

broke all their carts, and took a dozen of the principal gentlemen that were there, and brought them to me at Withrington, where I then lay. I made them welcome, and gave them the best entertainment that I could. They lay in the castle two or three days, and so I sent them home, they assuring me, that they never would hunt there again without leave, which they did truly perform all the time I stayed there; and I many times met them myself, and hunted with them two or three days; and so we continued good neighbours ever after; but the king complained to the queen very grievously of this fact. The queen and council liked very well of what I had done; but, to give the king some satisfaction to content him, my two officers were commanded to the Bishop of Durham's, there to remain prisoners during her majesty's pleasure. Within a fortnight I had them out again, and there was no more of this business. The rest of the time I stayed there, it was governed with great quietness." — CAREY'S *Memoirs*. Edit. 1808, p. 110.

duration. They were soldiers by profession, of hostile countries, jealous at once of their own honour and that of their nation, surrounded by warlike partisans and dependents, who animated every disagreement into a quarrel, and must therefore, on the whole, have preferred taking satisfaction for any insult at their own hand, and by their own force, than seeking it in a more peaceful manner from the opposite warden.

Sir Robert Carey gives us a singular picture of their conduct towards each other. Being deputy-warden of the east marches, he sent to Sir Robert Kerr of Cessford, the opposite Scottish warden, to appoint a meeting for regulation of the Border affairs. But Cessford apparently wished to anticipate one part of the affairs to be discussed. Having therefore received Carey's messenger, filled him with drink and put him to bed, he mounted his horse, entered England with an armed attendance, seized a Borderer against whom he alleged some cause of quarrel, and put him to death at his own door. After this exploit, he delivered a civil answer to Sir Robert Carey's servant, agreeing to the proposed interview. It was now the turn of the English warden to be offended; he neglected the appointment without notice to Cessford, leaving him to wait several hours at the place of meeting. The Borderers began to stir on both sides, and raids were made out of Scotland so often as three or four times a-week. The severe measures of Sir Robert Carey, who executed all thieves taken in the manner, or red-hand as it was called, in some degree checked these inroads. At length a

noted depredator, called Geordie Bourne, a special favourite of the Lord of Cessford, fell into his hands. The gentlemen of the country entreated him to enter into terms with Sir Robert Kerr for sparing this man's life; but, having visited him in disguise, and learned his habits from his own mouth, Carey resolved that no conditions should save him, and caused him to be executed accordingly before the gates of the castle.[1] In revenge of the death of this man, Sir Robert Kerr very nearly surprised a party of Carey's servants at Norham, who must have been cut to pieces, had they not, by their master's command, slept that night in the castle. The dissension between these two officers continued, until, upon such an occasion as we have noticed, p. 123, Cessford, along with the Lord of Buccleuch, was appointed to be delivered into England, when, with that sort of generous confidence which qualified the ferocity of the Border character, he chose his enemy, Sir Robert Carey, for his guardian; after which they lived on the most amicable terms with each other.[2]

Even the meetings of truce, appointed for the settlement of grievances betwixt the wardens, were very often converted into scenes of battle and bloodshed. Each warden, being themselves such fiery and martial characters as we have described,

[1] See Carey's *Memoirs*. Edit. 1808, p. 73; or *Border Minstrelsy*, vol. i., p. 247.

[2] Such tracts are like a glimpse of sunshine amid the lowering of a storm. Carey relates the circumstances which led to these agreements in the pithy style of Queen Elizabeth's time. —[See Carey's *Memoirs*. Edit. 1808, p. 80; or *Border Minstrelsy*, vol. i., p. 252.]

came to the place of meeting, attended by his guard of horsemen, and by all the warlike clans of his district, completely armed. Among these must often have been many names betwixt whom deadly feud existed; and, if they had no peculiar cause of animosity, their nations were habitually hostile, and it was the interest of the Borderers to exasperate that national animosity. Add to this, that the principal depredators being present, with their friends and allies, they had every motive to instigate any brawl which could interrupt the course of justice. It was, therefore, often in vain, that all men at those days of truce were discharged from *baughling* (brawling) or reproving with the subjects of the opposite realm, or from disturbing the assurance of peace, by word, deed, or countenance. Where there were so many combustible materials, the slightest spark served to kindle a conflagration.

Accordingly, repeated instances occur of such affrays happening, in which much gentle blood, and frequently that of the wardens themselves, stained the days appointed for the administration of Border justice. Thus, in the year 1511, Sir Robert Kerr of Cessford, warden of the middle marches, while at a march-meeting, was struck through with a lance by the bastard Heron, and despatched by Starhed and Lilburn, two English Borderers;[1] a slaughter which, amongst other causes of quarrel, gave ground to the war between

[1] [See *ante*, p. 56.]

England and Scotland, terminated by the fatal battle of Flodden.[1]

On a subsequent occasion, when Sir Francis Russell, third son of the second Earl of Bedford, chanced to be slain, the Scots appear to have been aggressors in their turn. Camden gives the following account of a fray which took place in the year 1585:—

"For when Sir John Foster, and Thomas Carre of Fernihurst, wardens of the middle marches betwixt the two kingdoms of England and Scotland, had appointed a meeting on the 27th of June, about certain goods unjustly taken away, and security was given on both sides by oath, according to custom, and proclamation made, that no man should *harm other, by word, deed, or look*, (as the Borderers speak,) the Scots came to the place of meeting armed in battle array, with ensigns displayed, and drums beating, contrary to custom and beyond expectation, being in number about three thousand, whereas the English were not above three hundred. Scarce were the wardens sat to hear the complaints, when on a sudden, upon an Englishman's being taken pilfering, there arose a tumult, and the Scots discharging a volley of shot, slew Russel, with some others, put the English to flight, and eagerly pursuing them the space of four miles into England, carried off some prisoners. Who was the author of this slaughter was not certainly known. The English laid the fault upon Arran, now chancellor of Scotland, and upon Fernihurst. The queen pressed, both by her letters and commissioners, to have the murderers delivered into her hands, inasmuch as Henry IV., King of England, had formerly delivered up into the hands of James IV., King of Scots, William Heron and seven Englishmen, for killing Robert Carre of Cessford upon a day of meeting; and Morton, the late regent, sent Carmichael, a Scot, into England for killing George Heron. The king protested his own innocency in the matter, and promised to send, not only Fernihurst immediately into England, but the chancellor too, if they could be convicted by clear and lawful proofs to have premeditately

[1] [See *Tales of a Grandfather*, 1*st Series*, vol. ii., ch. xii.]

infringed the security, or procured the murder. Fenwick, an Englishman, accused Fernihurst of the fact to his face; he avoided it by a flat denial, because the other could produce no Scottishman for a witness. For in these trials on the Borders, according to a certain privilege and custom agreed on amongst the Borderers, none but a Scot is to be admitted for a witness against a Scot, and none but an Englishman against an Englishman; insomuch, that if all the Englishmen which were upon the place had seen the murder committed before their eyes, yet their testimony had been of no value, unless some Scottishman also did witness the same. Nevertheless, Arran was confined to his house, and Fernihurst was committed to custody at Dundee, where afterwards he died; a stout and able warrior, ready for any great attempts and undertakings, and of an immoveable fidelity to the Queen of Scots, and the king her son; having been once or twice turned out of all his lands and fortunes, and banished the sight of his country and children, which yet he endured patiently, and, after so many crosses falling upon him together, perished unshaken and always like himself."—CAMDEN'S *Annalls at the year* 1585, in KENNET'S *History of England,* vol. ii., p. 505.

One of the latest of these affrays has been described with some lively colouring in the rude rhymes of an old Scottish minstrel. The place of meeting was the Reidswair, a spot on the very ridge of a bleak and waste tract of mountains, called the Carter-fells, which divide England from Scotland. The Scottish clans of the middle marches arrived in arms and in attendance upon Sir John Carmichael of Carmichael; and, from the opposite side, the Borderers of Tynedale and Redesdale advanced, with "jack and spear and bended bows," with Sir John Forster, the English warden. Yet the meeting began in mirth and good neighbourhood; and while the wardens proceeded to the business of the day, the armed Borderers of either

party engaged in sports, and played at cards or dice, or loitered around the moor. The merchants, or pedlars, erected their temporary booths, and displayed their wares, and the whole had the appearance of a peaceful holiday or rural fair. In the midst of this good-humour, the wardens were observed to raise their voices in angry altercation. A bill had been *fouled* upon one Farnstein, an English Borderer, who, according to custom and law of march, ought to have been delivered up to the Scots. The excuses made by Sir John Forster did not satisfy the Scottish warden, who taxed him with partiality. At this the English warden, rising suddenly, and drawing up his person so as to have the full advantage of all his height, contemptuously desired Carmichael to match himself with his equals in birth and quality. These signs of resentment were sufficient hints to the Tynedale Borderers, who immediately shot off a flight of arrows among the Scots. The warcry and slogan of the different clans then rose on either side; and these ready warriors, immediately starting to their weapons, fought it out manfully. By the opportune arrival of the citizens of Jedburgh, armed with firearms, the Scots obtained the victory; Sir George Heron of Chipchase, and some other Englishmen of rank, being slain on the spot, and Sir John Forster himself, with others of his retinue, made prisoners. This affray gave great offence to Elizabeth;[1] and the Regent Morton, stooping

[1] [This skirmish happened on the 7th of June, 1575. See *The Raid of the Reidswire—Border Minstrelsy*, vol. ii., p. 15.]

before her displeasure, sent Carmichael to answer for his conduct at the court of England, where, however, he was not long detained.

Besides the duties of annoying the hostile frontiers in war, and maintaining amicable relations with them in time of peace, there was a sort of mixed obligation on the wardens, of a nature somewhat delicate; they were expected to avail themselves of their proper strength to retaliate such offences as they could not obtain reparation for from the opposite warden, or contentedly sit down under, without compromising their own honour and that of their country. This mode of compensating injuries by retaliation always added considerably to the discords and inroads upon the Borders, and licensed for the time the enterprises of the most desperate marauders. One or two instances of the manner in which the wardens acted on such occasions, and of the circumstances which gave rise to their appearing in arms, will complete our account of the duties of these guardians of the frontiers.

The Debateable Land (before its final division) was a constant subject of dissension between the opposite wardens of the west marches. To require satisfaction from the English for the inroads of the Borderers inhabiting this tract, or to render satisfaction to them for what the people of the Debateable Land had suffered from the Scottish in return, would have been to acknowledge the district to be a part of England. Lord Maxwell, therefore, in 1550, declared his intention of marching against the men of the Debateable Land, not

as Englishmen, but as Scottish rebels, and laying waste their possessions. Lord Dacre, the opposite warden, acted with equal spirit and prudence. He drew out the forces of his march upon the verge of the acknowledged possessions of England, thus affording countenance, but no active assistance, to the men of the Debateable ground. These, a fierce and untractable set of people, chiefly of the clans of Armstrong and Græme, seeing themselves well supported, *pricked* or skirmished with Lord Maxwell on his entering their district, and took one or two of his followers, by which repulse, backed by the good countenance shown by the English warden, the expedition of Lord Maxwell was disconcerted. This brief campaign is mentioned in King Edward the Fourth's Journal.[1]

Numerous occasions took place, when the wardens, on either or both sides, resenting some real or supposed denial of justice, endeavoured to right themselves by *riding*, as it was termed, that is, making incursions on the opposite country. This was at no time more common than in the year 1596, when a singular incident gave rise to a succession of these aggressions, and wellnigh occasioned a war between the kingdoms.

In the year 1596, there was a meeting on the

[1] "August 16, 1549. The Earl of Maxwell came down to the North Border with a good power to overthrow the Gremes, who were a certain family that were yielded to me; but the Lord Dacre stood before his face with a good band of men, and so put him from his purpose; and the gentlemen called Gremes skirmished with the said earl, slaying certain of his men."

borders of Liddesdale betwixt the deputies of the Lord Scroope of Bolton, warden of the west marches, and the Lord of Buccleuch, keeper of Liddesdale. When the business of the day was over, and the meeting broken up, the English chanced to observe a Scottish Borderer, of the clan of Armstrong, called Willie of Kinmont, celebrated for his depredations. He had been in attendance, like other Border riders, upon the Scottish officer, and was now returning home on the north side of the river Liddle. Although he was on Scottish ground, and that the assurance of truce ought to have protected him, the temptation to seize an offender so obnoxious was too great to be resisted. A large body of English horsemen crossed the river, pursued and took him, and lodged him in Carlisle Castle. As Lord Scroope refused to give Kinmont up, although thus unwarrantably taken prisoner, Buccleuch resolved to set him at liberty by force, and, with a small body of determined followers, he surprised the Castle of Carlisle, and without doing any injury to the garrison, or to the warden, carried off the prisoner.[1] This spirited action was so much admired by the Scottish nation, that even King James, however much afraid of displeasing Elizabeth, and though urged by her with the most violent complaints and threats, hesitated to deliver up the warden who had so well sustained the dignity of his office and the immunities of the kingdom. But this act of reprisal gave rise to many others. Sir Thomas Musgrave rode

[1] [See the narrative prefixed to the historical ballad of *Kinmont Willie—Border Minstrelsy*, vol. ii., p. 32.]

into Scotland, and made spoil like an ordinary Borderer; and Henry Widdrington laid waste and burned Cavers, belonging to the Sheriff of Teviotdale. Buccleuch's life was said to be the aim of these marauders, and, as it was alleged, with the privity of the Queen of England.[1] On the other hand, the Lords of Buccleuch and Cessford vexed the English Border by constant and severe incursions, so that nothing was heard of but burning, *hership* (devastation) and slaughter. In Tynedale, Buccleuch seized upon no less than thirty-six English freebooters, and put them to death without mercy. The wrath of Elizabeth waxed uncontrollable.[2] "I marvel," are her own royal expres-

1 Rymer's *Fœdera*, vol. xvi., pp. 307, 308.

2 Her instructions to her ambassador, Sir William Bowes, mark at once the state of the marches and the extremity of her majesty's displeasure. They occur in Rymer's *Fœdera*, vol. xiv., p. 112.

"ELIZABETH R.

"Trusty and welbeloved, We greet you well.

"When you departed, we delivered you our full pleasure how you should, upon your arryval at Carlile, and how you should address yourself to the king upon his approach to the Borders, or upon any difficulties occurring in the treaties, since which time we have received from our wardens nothing but frequent advertisements, both from the east and middle marches, especially how daily they are spoyled and burned by the incursions from the opposite borders; and for more open shewe of injury, Buklugh himself, the king's officer, hath been a fresh ringleader of the same, whereby appeareth how little likelihood there is that such wardens will restrayne their inferiors, or the king himselfe reforme any thing, seing he doth not only tollerat but cherish them, since they were found most faultie, and hath, in lieu of punishment, given some of them newe favors, and left us neglected in the eye of the world, with frutelesse promisses of satisfaction; by expec-

sions, "how the king thinks me so base-minded as to sit down with such dishonourable treatment. Let him know we will be satisfied, or else"—— Some of James's ancestors would have bid her

"Choke in thy threat. We can say *or* as loud."

But James judged it more safe to pacify her by surrendering his officers to England, where, however, they were not long detained.

tation whereof our people fynde themselves abandoned to utter ruine and miserie.

"You shall therefor repair to the king, and, by the means of our ambassador, require speedy access, at which time you may plainly declare unto him the generalities above mentioned; and you shall also furnish yourself with an abstract of all the mayne wronges newly done us, and deliver to the king how much it troubleth us to be requyted with nothing but continuall frutes of spoyles and injuries, where we have ever sown continuall care and kyndness; and if it may be deemed that we do less value the estate of those poor creatures who are more remote from us, than of others who daily are in compasse of our eye, surely they shall be deceived; for in our care for their preservation (over whom God hath constituted us equally the only head and ruler) wee never do admit any inequality or difference of care, either for point of justice to be administered by ourselves, or satisfaction to be procured from them that any way oppress them.

"But we do see that tyme spends on to their loss, that our people are vexed, our commissioners are tyred, and our selve delayed; an therefor we require you, seeing all promises are so little observed, and all references to conventions so partially conducted, to let the king know that we cannot deny the just and pitifull appeals which our dear people make for protection and redress, but will enable them to make these unruly rabble of outlawes and ravagers know and feel that they shall taste of a sourer neighbourhood than they have done of late, seeing they do nothing but insult upon our toleration of many injuries, whilst we are apt (out of respect to the king only) to quietness."

It was not, therefore, until the union of the crowns, that any material alteration took place in the manners or customs of the Borders. Upon that great event, the forces of both countries acting with more uniform good understanding, as now the servants of the same master, suppressed every disorder of consequence. The most untractable Borderers were formed into a body of troops, which Buccleuch conducted to the Belgic wars. The Border counties were disarmed, excepting such weapons as were retained by gentlemen of rank and repute.[1] And the moss-troopers, who continued

[1] Amongst other articles agreed upon betwixt the English and Scottish commissioners for the final pacification of the Borders, 9th April, 1605, after recommending that all deadly feuds should be put to agreement, or those who refused to acquiesce should be detained prisoners, that heavy mulcts and penalties should be inflicted on such Scottishmen and English as broke the peace by any act of violence, and that robbers from either country should be punished with death, there is a clause of the following tenor: "Also, it is agreed that proclamation shall be made, that all inhabiting within Tindale and Riddesdale in Northumberland, Bewcastledale Wilgavey, the north part of Gilsland, Esk and Leven in Cumberland, East and West Tevidale, Liddesdale, Eskdale, Ewsdale, and Annerdale in Scotland, (saving noblemen and gentlemen unsuspected of felony or theft, and not being of broken clans,) and their household servants dwelling within those several places before recited, shall put away all armour and weapons, as well offensive as defensive, as jacks, spears, lances, swords, daggers, steelcaps, hagbuts, pistols, plate sleeves, and such like; and shall not keep any horse, gelding, or mare, above the price of 50s. sterling, or L.30 Scots, upon like pain of imprisonment.

"*Item*, That proclamation be made, that none of what calling soever, within the countries lately called the Borders, of either of the kingdoms, shall wear, carry, or bear any pistols, hagbuts, or guns of any sort, but in his majesty's service,

to exercise their former profession, experienced in great numbers the unsparing and severe justice of the Earl of Dunbar.

But though the evil was remedied for the present, the root remained ready to sprout upon the least encouragement. In the civil wars of Charles I., the Borderers resumed their licentious habits, particularly after the war had been transferred to Scotland, and the exploits of the moss-troopers flourish in the diaries and military reports of the time.[1] In the reign of Charles II. we learn their existence still endured, by the statutes directed against them.[2] And it is said that non-conforming pres-

upon pain of imprisonment, according to the laws of either kingdom."

[1] In a letter from Cromwell's headquarters, Edinburgh, October 16, 1650, the exploits of the Borderers in their old profession are alluded to. "My last told you of a letter to be sent to Colonels Kerr and Straughan from hence. Satturday the 26, the commissary-general despatcht away a trumpet with that letter, as also gave another to the Sheriff of Cumberland, to be speeded away to M. John Scot, bailiff, and B. brother to the Lord of Buccliew, for his demanding restitution upon his tenants, the moss-troopers, for the horses by them stolne the night we quartered in their country, since which, promises hath been made of restitution, and we doubt not to receive it very suddenly, or else to take satisfaction another way ourselves." In the accounts of Monk's campaigns, given in the News Letter of the time, there is frequent mention of the moss-troopers.

[2] The 13th and 14th Charles II., ch. 3,—18th, Charles II., ch. 3 and 29, and 30th Charles II, ch. 1, all proceed upon similar preambles, stating, in substance,—"Whereas, a great number of lewd, disorderly, and lawless persons, being thieves and robbers, who are commonly called *moss-troopers*, have successively, for many and sundry years last past, been bred, resided in, and frequented the Borders of the two

byterian preachers were the first who brought this rude generation to any sense of the benefits of religion.[1] However this may be, there seems little

respective counties of Northumberland and Cumberland, and the most adjacent parts of Scotland; and they, taking the opportunity of the large waste ground, heaths, and mosses, and the many intricate and dangerous ways and by-paths in those parts, do usually, after the most notorious crimes committed by them, escape over from the one kingdom to the other respectively, and so avoid the hand of justice, in regard the offences done and perpetrated in the one kingdom cannot be punished in the other.

"And whereas, since the time of the late unhappy distractions, such offences and offenders as aforesaid have exceedingly more increased and abounded; and the several inhabitants of the said respective counties have been, for divers years last past, necessitated, at their own free and voluntary charge, to maintain several parties of horse for the necessary defence of their persons, families, and goods, and for bringing the offenders to justice." Upon this preamble follow orders for assessing the inhabitants of these disturbed counties in the sums necessary to pay sufficient bands of men for protection of the inhabitants. These acts are still in force.

[1] This appears from a curious passage in the Life of Richard Cameron, who gave name to the sect of Cameronians. "After he was licensed, they sent him at first to preach in Annandale. He said, How could he go there? He knew not what sort of people they were. But Mr Welch said, Go your way, Ritchie, and set the fire of hell to their tails. He went, and the first day he preached upon that text, *How shall I put thee among the children*, &c. In the application he said, Put you among the children! the offspring of robbers and thieves. Many have heard of Annandale thieves.—Some of them got a merciful cast that day, and told it afterwards, that it was the first field-meeting that ever they attended; and that they went out of curiosity to see how a minister could preach in a tent, and people sit on the ground."—HARRIES' *Scottish Worthies*, p. 361.

Cleland also, the poet of the sect of Cameronians, takes credit for the same conversion, and puts the following verses into

doubt that, until the union of the crowns, the manners of these districts retained a tincture of their former rudeness, and would have relapsed, had occasion offered, into their former ferocity. Since that fortunate era, all that concerns the military habits, customs, and manners of what were once the frontier counties, falls under the province into which these details may serve to introduce the reader—the study, namely, of BORDER ANTIQUITIES.

the mouth of a prelatist haranguing the Highlanders, and warning them against the inconvenient strictness of the presbyterian preachers:—

> "If their doctrine there get rooting,
> Then farewell theift, the best of booting,
> And this ye see is very clear,
> Dayly experience makes it appear;
> For instance, lately on the Borders,
> Where there was nought but theft and murders,
> Rapine, cheating, and resetting,
> Slight-of-hand—fortunes getting;
> Their designation, as ye ken,
> Was all along, the *Tacking Men.*
> Now rebels more prevails with words,
> Then drawgoons does with guns and swords,
> So that their bare preaching now,
> Makes the rush-bush keep the cow
> Better than Scots or English kings
> Could do by kilting them with strings;
> Yea, those that were the greatest rogues,
> Follows them over hills and bogues,
> Crying for mercy and for preaching,
> For they'll now hear no others teaching."
>
> CLELAND'S *Poems*, 1697, p. 30.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

Account of the Attack and Defence of Two Border Strongholds, extracted from Patton's Account of Somerset's Expedition to Scotland in 1544. *Dalzell's Fragments of Scottish History, p.* 36.

" In the way we should go, a mile and a half from Dunglas northward, there were two pyles or holds, Thornton and Anderwike, set both on craggy foundation, and divided a stone's cast asunder, by a deep gut, wherein ran a little river. Thornton belonged to the Lord Hume, and was kept then by one Tom Trotter whereunto my lord's grace over night, for summons, sent Somerset, his herald, toward whom four or five of this captain's prickers with their gaddes (i. e. lances) ready charged did right hastily direct their course; but Trotter both honestly defended the herald and sharply rebuked his men, and said, for the summons, he would come speak with my lorde's grace himself; notwithstanding he came not, but straight locked up about 16 poore souls like the soldiers of Dunglas fast within the house, took the keys with him, and commanding them they should defend the house and tarry within (as they could not get out) till his return, which should be on the morrow, with munition and relief, he with his prickers prickt quite his ways. Anderwick pertained to the Lord of Hamilton, and was kept by his son and heir, (whom by custom they call the Master of Hamilton,) and an 8 more with him, gentlemen for the most part, as we heard say. My lord's grace, at his coming nigh, sent unto both these piles, which upon summons refusing to render, were straight assailed; Thornton by battery of four of our great pieces of ordi-

nance, and certain of Sir Peter Mewtus' hackbutters to watch the loop holes and windows on all sides, and Anderwick by a sort of the same hakbutters alone, who so well besturred them, that when these keepers had rammed up their outer doors, clayed and stopt up their stairs within, and kept themselves aloft for defence of their house about the battlements, the hakbutters got in and fyred them underneath, whereby being greatly troubled with smoke and smother, and brought in desperation of defence, they called pitifully over their walls to my lord's grace for mercy; who notwithstanding their great obstinacy, and the sample other of the enemies might have had by their punishment, of his noble generositie, and by these words making half excuse for them, (men may some time do that hastily in a jeer, whereof after they may soon repent them,) did take them to grace, and therefore sent one straight to them. But ere the messenger came, the hakbutters had gotten up to them, and killed eight of them aloft, one leaped over the walls, and running more than a furlong after, was slain without in a water. All this while at Thornton, our assault and their defence was stoutly continued, but well perceiving how on the one side they were battered, mined on the other, kept in with the hakbutters round about, and some of our men within also occupying all the house under them, (for they had likewise stopt up themselves in the highest of their house,) and so to do nothing inward or outward, neither by shooting of base (whereof they had but one or two) nor tumbling of stones, (the things of their chief annoyance,) whereby they might be able any while to resist our power, or save themselves, they plucked in a banner that afore they had set out in defiance, and put out out over the walls a white linnen cloth tied on a stick's end, crying all with one tune for mercy; but having answer by the whole voice of the assailers, they were traitors, and it was too late, they plucked in their stick and stuck up the banner of defiance again, shot of, hurled stones, and did what else they could, with great courage of their side, and little hurt of ours. Yet then after, being assured by our ernesty, that we had vowed the winning of their hold, before our departure, and then, that their obstinacy could deserve no less than death, pluckt in their banner once again, and cried upon mercie; and being generally answered, 'Nay, nay, look never for it, for ye are errant traitors,' then made they petition that if they should needs die, yet that my lord's grace would be so good to them as they might be hanged, whereby they might somewhat reconcile themselves to Godward, and not to dye in malice with so great danger of

their souls; a policy sure in my mind, though but of gross heads, yet of a fine device. Sir Miles Partridge being nigh about this pile at that time, and spying one in a red doublet, did guess he should be an Englishman, and therefore came and furthered this petition to my lord's grace the rather, which then took effect They came and humbled themselves to his grace, whereupon, without more hurt, they were but commanded to the provost-marshal. It is somewhat here to consider, I know not whether the destiny or hap of man's life; the more worthy men, the less offenders, and more in the judges grace, were slain; and the beggars, the obstinate rebells, that deserved nought but cruelty, were saved. To say on now, the house was soon after so blown up with powder, that more than one-half fell straight down to rubbish and dust, the rest stood all to be shaken with rifts and chinks. Anderwick was burned, and all the houses of office and stacks of corn about them both.

No. II.

Account of the Borderers, translated from Leslæus, de Origine, Moribus, et Rebus gestis Scotorum.

Among all the provinces of Scotland, those which are situated next to England assume to themselves the greatest habits of license, in which they frequently indulge with impunity. For as, in the time of war, they are readily reduced to extreme poverty by the almost daily inroads of the enemy, so, on the restoration of peace, they entirely neglect to cultivate their lands, though fertile, from the fear of the fruits of their labour being immediately destroyed by a new war. Whence it happens that they seek their subsistence by robberies, or rather by plundering and rapine, (for they are particularly averse to shedding of blood;) nor do they much concern themselves whether it be from Scots or English that they rob and plunder, and carry off by stealth their booty of horses, cattle, and sheep. They live chiefly on flesh, milk, and boiled barley. Their use of bread is very limited, as well as of good beer and wine, in neither of which they take much delight, even when they obtain them. Their residences consist of huts and cottages, about the burning of which they are nowise concerned. The chiefs construct for themselves a pyramidical kind of towers, which they call *peels*, made entirely of

stone, and which cannot be demolished by fire, nor thrown down without great force and labour.

There are, however, among them, chiefs of noble rank, some of whom, although they commit no depredations openly themselves, do, notwithstanding, lest they should give offence to their own tribe, connive at those done by others, even though they do not participate in the plunder. Of this they are highly careful, lest, if they should behave harshly to their own people in time of peace, they should find them less obedient at the approach of war. And although there may be some few men of influence, who are sincerely earnest about justice and civil affairs, yet they cannot resist the multitude, who are so hardened by their inveterate habits, that they have become as it were a second nature.

Besides, if the chief men should require auxiliary forces from the king against those robbers, as has been often attempted, they only lose their labour. Indeed, these plunderers are so well protected by the nature of the ground, that should they be forced out from their thickest woods, they instantly betake themselves to the rugged mountains; if again they are expelled from these, they take their flight towards the banks of rivers and the marshes. If they shall still find it necessary to remove quarters, they next, with perfect safety to themselves, entice their pursuers into some of the most intricate parts of the marshes, which, though to appearance they are green meadows, and as solid as the ground, are nevertheless seen, upon a person's entering upon them, to give way, and in a moment to swallow him up into the deep abyss. Not only do the robbers themselves pass over these gulfs with wonderful agility and lightness of foot, but even they accustom their horses to cross many places with their knees bent, and to get over where our footmen could scarcely dare to follow; and chiefly on this account, they seldom shoe their horses. They reckon it a great disgrace, and the part of a mean person, for any one to make a journey on foot, whence it follows that they are mostly all horsemen. If, therefore, they be possessed of nimble horses, and have sufficient wherewith to ornament their own persons and those of their wives, they are by no means anxious about other pieces of household furniture.

What some have said of the Scots being in the practice of living on human flesh, cannot be ascribed to any others than these Borderers, and not to them all, but only to those of Annandale; indeed, our writers do say, that only the Ordovici, who inhabited the modern Annandale, were wont to feed upon the flesh of their captives, whom they also distinguish for a farther piece of cruelty,

that the women, namely, should with their own hand kill their husbands who had been vanquished in war, on their return home, as if the fact of being defeated was sufficient indication of cowardice, which they looked upon as the highest crime in a man. But the ferocious habit of a small tribe, which is long since disused, ought not to be ascribed to the whole nation of the Scots; much less that which is quoted from D. Hieronymus, that one of the Scots themselves was seen in Gaul to eat human flesh, although some were of opinion that he was a Scythian. They might as reasonably also be pleased to affirm, upon the evidence of a single instance, that all the Scots at this day live upon raw salmon, even when newly taken out of the rivers, without salt or bread; for there is an instance quite familiar to us, of a man very noted among ourselves, called Monanus Hogg, who had been condemned to exile in his youth, and, unknown to any, had concealed himself for some time near a certain river, where he could find no meat at all, and perceiving that he could easily catch salmon upon the sandy shallows, by an art which he had learnt before, he forthwith caught and ate them raw, and became at length so inured to that sort of food, that when an old man, he was often seen to eat freely, and without the least disgust, as much raw salmon, as many others could do of the bes fish boiled, and that in the presence of several who would not believe it; a wonderful instance how pressing a thing want is, in cases of adversity, and how powerful is custom, that second nature.[1]

But I return to our Dalesmen, or Borderers, in whom, though some things are to be noticed to their dispraise, yet there are others to be greatly admired; for most of them, when determined upon seeking their supply from the plunder of the neighbouring districts, use the greatest possible precaution not to shed the blood of those that oppose them; for they have a persuasion that all property is common by the law of nature, and is therefore liable to be appropriated by them in their necessity, but that murder and other injuries are prohibited by the Divine law. If, however, they do commit any voluntary slaughter, it is generally done in revenge of some injury, but more frequently of the death of some of their own relations, even though it be in consequence of the laws of the kingdom. Then arises a deadly hatred, not of one against one, or a few against a few, but of them all, how numerous soever the tribe may be, against all of the opposite name, however innocent or ignorant of the alleged injury;

[1] In the curious account of the Tonga Islands, by Mr Mariner, it appears that he easily acquired the habit of eating raw fish among the South Sea islanders.

which plague of deadly feud, though a general calamity through the kingdom, is chiefly proper to these people.

To their praise it may be added, that, having once pledged their faith, even to an enemy, they are very strict in observing it, insomuch, that they think nothing can be more heinous than violated fidelity. If, however, any one shall be found guilty of this crime among them, it is usual for him who has received the injury, or any one of his name, to suspend the culprit's glove upon the top of an elevated spear, and to ride about with it, exhibiting it in reproach of his violation of faith, which is done in their solemn conventions, as, for example, in those while the wardens of the marches of both kingdoms are sitting to make amends for injuries, according to custom. They think there cannot be a greater mark of disgrace than this, and esteem it a greater punishment even than an honourable death inflicted on the guilty person; and those of the same tribe frequently resent it in the same manner. Nor, indeed, have the Borderers, with such ready frenzy as many others of the country, joined the heretical secession from the common faith of the holy church. They take great pleasure in their own music, and in their rhythmical songs, which they compose upon the exploits of their ancestors, or in their own ingenious stratagems in plundering, or their artificial defences when taken. Besides, they think the art of plundering so very lawful, that they never say over their prayers more fervently, or have more devout recurrence to the beads of their rosaries, than when they have made an expedition, as they frequently do, of forty or fifty miles, for the sake of booty.

They leave their frontiers in the night time in troops, going through impassable places, and through many by-paths. In the day time they refresh their horses, and recruit their own strength, in hiding places prepared before-hand, until the approach of night, when they advance to their place of destination. Having seized upon their booty, they in the same manner return by night, through circuits and by-ways, to their own habitations. The more expert each leader is in making his way through these dreary places, windings, and precipices, in the darkest night, he is so much the more accounted a person of superior ingenuity, and held in greater honour; and with such secrecy can they proceed, that they very rarely allow their prize to be recovered, unless they be sometimes tracked by their opponents, when discovered by keen-scented dogs, who always follow them in the right path.

But if they are taken, their eloquence is so powerful, and the sweetness of their language so winning, that they even can move both judges and accusers, however severe before, if not to mercy, at least to admiration and compassion.

No. III.

Border Clans.

The principle of clanship had been reluctantly acknowledged by the Scottish legislature, not as a system approved of, but as an inveterate evil, to cure which they were obliged to apply extraordinary remedies. By the statute 1581, chap. 112, it was declared, that the clans of thieves, keeping together by occasion of their surnames, or near neighbourhood, or society in theft, were not subjected to the ordinary course of justice; and therefore it was made lawful, that whatever true and obedient subject should suffer loss by them, might not only apprehend, slay, and arrest the persons of the offenders, but of any others being of the same clan. And thus the whole sept was rendered jointly answerable, and liable to be proceeded against, in the way of retaliation, for the delinquencies of each individual.

But to render the recourse of the injured parties more effectual, an elaborate statute, (1587, ch. 94, 97,) made two years afterwards, proceeding on the same melancholy preamble of waste and depredation committed on the Borders and Highlands, directs that security shall be found by those landlords and bailies on whose grounds the offending clansmen dwelt, that they would bring them in to abide process of law when complained of, or otherwise drive them from their grounds. It was further decreed, that the clans, chiefs, and chieftains, as well on the Highlands as on the Borders, with the principal branches of each surname who depended upon their several captains by reason of blood or neighbourhood, should find hostages or pledges for keeping good rule in time coming, under pain of the execution of these hostages unto the death, in case transgression should happen without amends being made by delivery of the criminal. These hostages were to be kept in close prison until the chiefs by whom they were entered in pledge found security that they would not *break ward*, that is, make their escape. But on such security being found, the hostages were to be placed in *free ward*; that is, were

to remain prisoners on parole at their own expense, in the families of such inland gentlemen and barons as should be assigned to take charge of them respectively, the Borderers being quartered on the north, and the Highlanders on the south side of the Forth; which barons were bound, under a penalty of L.200, not to license their departure. The clans who should fail to enter such pledges within the time assigned, were to be pursued as incorrigible freebooters, with fire and sword. To render the provisions of this act yet more effectual, it was appointed (chap. 96) that all Highlanders and Borderers should return from the inland country to the place of their birth: (chap. 97,) That all the clans should be entered in a register, with the names of the hostages or sureties, and of the landlords or bailies. Also, (chap. 98,) that vagabonds and broken men, for whom no sureties or pledges were entered, as belonging to no known clan, should find security to undergo the law, under pain of being denounced rebels. Also, (chap. 100,) that the security found by the feudal landlords and bailies to present such offenders as dwelt on their lands to regular trial, was distinct from, and independent of, that which should be found by the patriarchal captain, head, or chieftain of the clan, and that each subsisted and might be acted on without prejudice to the other. These securities being obtained, it was provided, that when goods or cattle were carried off by the individuals of any clan, the party injured should intimate the robbery to the chief, charging him to make restitution within fifteen days, wherein if he failed, the injured party should have action against him, and other principal persons of the clan, to the amount of his loss.

These, and other minute regulations to the same purpose, show that the clan system had become too powerful for the government, and that, in order to check the disorders to which it gave rise, the legislature were obliged to adopt its own principle, and hold the chief, or patriarch of the tribe, as liable for all the misdeeds of the surname.

The rolls which were made up in consequence of these acts of parliament, gives us an enumeration of the nobles and barons (several of whom were themselves also chiefs) who possessed property in the disturbed Border districts, and also of the clans who dwelt in them.

Roll of the Names of the Landlords and Bailies of Lands dwelling on the Borders,[1] *where broken Men have dwelt and presently dwell. A. D.* 1587.

MIDDLE MARCH.

The Earl of Bothwell (*formerly Hepburn, then Stuart.*)
The Laird of Fairnyherst (*Kerr.*)
The Earl of Angus (*Douglas.*)
The Laird of Buckcleuch (*Scott.*)
The Sheriff of Teviotdale (*Douglas of Cavers.*)
The Laird of Bedroule (*Turnbull.*)
The Laird of Wauchop.
The Lord Herries (*formerly Harries, then Maxwell.*)
The Laird of Howpaisley (*Scott.*)
George Turnbull of Halroule.
The Laird of Littledene (*Kerr.*)
The Laird of Drumlanrigg (*Douglas.*)
The Laird of Chisholme (*Chisholme.*)

WEST MARCH.

The Lord Maxwell (*Maxwell.*)
The Laird of Drumlanrigg (*Douglas.*)
The Laird of Johnston (*Johnstone.*)
The Laird of Applegirth (*Jardine.*)
The Laird of Holmends (*Carruthers.*)
The Laird of Gratney (*Johnstone.*)
The Lord Herries (*Maxwell.*)
The Laird of Dunwiddie.
The Laird of Lochinvar (*Gordon.*)

The Roll of the Clans that have Captains and Chieftains on whom they depend oftimes against the Will of their Landlords, and of some special Persons of Branches of the said Clans.

MIDDLE MARCH.

Elliots[2] (*Laird of Lairistoun.*)

[1] Those of the Highlands are omitted, as not being comprehended in the present subject.

[2] The Elliots and Armstrongs inhabited chiefly Liddesdale.

Armstrongs (*Laird of Mangertoun.*)
Nicksons.[1]
Crossers.

WEST MARCH.

Scotts of Ewsedale.[2]
Beatisons.[3]
Littles (*chief unknown.*)
Thomsons (*chief unknown.*)
Glendinnings (*Glendonwyne of that Ilk.*)
Irvings (*Irving of Bonshaw.*)
Bells (*believed to be Bell of Blacket House.*)
Carruthers (*Laird of Holmends.*)
Grahames.[4]
Johnstones (*Laird of Johnstone.*)
Jardanes (*Laird of Applegirth.*)
Moffetts (*chief unknown, but the name being territorial, it is probably an ancient clan.*)
Latimers (*chief unknown.*)

A little work, called *Monipenny's Chronicle*,[5] published in 1597 and 1633, gives, among other particulars concerning Scotland, a list of the principal clans and surnames on the Borders not landed, as well as of the chief riders and men of name among them. From this authority, we add the following list of *foraying*, or *riding* clans, as they were termed, not found in the parlia-

[1] The Nixons and Crossers might rather be termed English than Scottish Borderers. They inhabited the Debateable Land, and were found in Liddesdale, but were numerous in Cumberland.

[2] It is not easy to conjecture whether one part or branch of this numerous surname is distinguished from the rest, or whether it must be understood to comprehend the whole clan. The chief of the name was Scott of Buccleuch.

[3] Or Beatties, a name still numerous on the Borders. They were dispossessed of large possessions in Eskdale, by the Scots, who killed many of them in the struggle. The name of their chief is unknown. The last was called The Galliard, slain at the Galliard's-haugh, near Langholm.

[4] The chief of the Grahames is unknown. The clan were rather English than Scottish. They inhabited the Debateable Land.

[5] [The small volume entitled *The Abridgment, or Summarie of the Scots Chronicles, from Fergusius's, the first, &c., with a true description of the whole realme of Scotland, &c.*, is rarely to be met with *per se*. It is, however, reprinted in the first volume of Wylie's *Miscellanea Scotica*, 4 vols. 12mo. Glasgow, 1818-20.]

mentary roll of 1587. It commences with the east marches, which being in a state of comparative good order, were not included under the severe enactments of 1587.

EAST MARCHES.

Bromfields (*chief, Bromfield of Gordon Mains, or of that Ilk.*)
Trotters (*chief unknown.*)
Diksons (*chief unknown.*)
Redpeth (*Laird of Redpath.*)
Gradens (*Laird of Graden originally their chief.*)
Youngs (*chief unknown.*)
Pringles (*believed to be Pringle of Galashiels.*)
Tates (*Tait of Pirn.*)
Middlemast (*chief unknown.*)
Burns (*chief unknown.*)
Dalgleishes (*Dalgleish of that Ilk.*)
Davisons (*Davison of Symiston.*)
Pyles (*Pyle, or Peele, of Milnheuch.*)
Robisons (*chief unknown—a Cumberland clan.*)
Ainslies (*chief unknown.*)
Olivers (*chief unknown—believed to be Lustruther.*)
Laidlaws (*chief unknown: It is said by tradition the family came from Ireland, and that the name was originally Ludlow.*)

LIDDESDALE.

Parks (*chief, John of Park.*)
Hendersons (*chief unknown.*)

WEST MARCHES.

Carliles (*Lord Carlile*)
Romes, Gasses } *Clans now almost extinct—chiefs unknown.*

An equally absolute authority is the enumeration which is put by Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, in his very curious drama called the Partium, into the mouth of Common Thift, a Borderer, and who, being brought to condign punishment, takes leave of his countrymen and companions in iniquity:—

"Adieu, my brother Annan thieves,
That helpit me in my mischieves,
Adieu, Crossars, Niksons, and Bells,
Oft have we fared through the fells;

Adieu, Robsons, Hanslies,[1] and Pyles,
That in our craft have mony wiles,
Littles, Trumbulls, [2] and Armstrongs;
Adieu, all thieves that me belongs,
Taylors, Eurwings, [3] and Elwands, [4]
Speedy of foot and light of hands;
The Scots of Ewesdail and the Græmes,
I have na time to tell your names;
With King Correction be ye fangit,
Believe right sure ye will be hangit."

---

[1] Ainslie, as now spelled and pronounced.
[2] The popular pronunciation of Turnbull.
[3] Spelled Curwings: the same with Irving, which is sometimes popularly pronounced Euring as if the v. were an u.
[4] Elwands, or Elwoods, the old way of spelling Elliot.

PROVINCIAL ANTIQUITIES

OF

SCOTLAND.

PROVINCIAL ANTIQUITIES

OF

SCOTLAND.

CRICHTON CASTLE.

[FROM PAINTINGS BY J. M. W. TURNER, AND REV. J. THOMSON.]

THE Castle of Crichton is situated on the banks of the Tyne, there an inconsiderable stream, ten miles south from Edinburgh, and about two miles above the village of Pathhead, on the Lauder road. The river flows through a grassy valley, bounded by sloping banks, which, at least till of late, being chiefly covered with copse and underwood, formed a wild and beautiful fringe to the level pasture-land through which the brook winds. The stream itself is more deep, sluggish, and slow, than most of the Scottish rivers, and in that particular rather resembles those of South Britain. The very high prices which alders have lately borne, owing to their forming the most proper charcoal for making gunpowder, has occasioned the fall of many of those natural thickets. But it is to be hoped, that the demand for this formidable article of merchandise

will not be again so imperative, and that the proprietors may have leisure to replace these coppices by more permanent plantations.

The Castle was built at different periods, and forms, on the whole, one large square pile of irregular height, enclosing an inner court. It is situated upon a sharp angle of the almost precipitous bank which we have mentioned as the boundary of the dale. The lofty, massive, and solid architecture, impresses the spectator with an emotion rather of awe than of beauty. Yet the interior is so far from being of a rude character, that we shall hereafter have occasion to notice its architectural merits. At present, we propose to introduce the reader to the general history of the building, so far as it has been traced, as well as of its first possessors, to whom the Castle and Barony gave name.

The family of Crichton was ancient and honourable, but remained long among the rank of lesser barons, and owed its great rise to the genius and talent of an individual statesman, distinguished for policy and intrigue beyond what is usual in a dark age. The name being territorial, and derived from the neighbouring village, seems to have been assumed about the period when surnames became common in Scotland. A William de Crichtoun occurs in the Lennox Chartulary about 1240,[1] and a Thomas de Crichton figures in the Ragman Roll in 1296; a wretched document, to which a name seems to have been accidentally affixed as contemptuous as it deserved, since by its tenor most of the

[1] *Wood's Peerage*, vol. i., p. 603.

ancient families of Scotland submitted to Edward III.[1] More honourable records afterwards distinguish a Sir John de Crichton in the reign of David Bruce. A William de Crichton is frequently mentioned in the end of the fourteenth century; and finally, a John Crichton had a charter of that barony from Robert III. These ancient Lords of the Castle and Barony of Crichton, although men of note and estate, were still numbered among the lesser barons, who were not entitled to the rank of nobility.

Sir William Crichton, son of the last-mentioned baron, with talents and a disposition not unlike to those which distinguished Ras Michael at the Court of Gondar,[2] was destined to rise to a greater eminence, and attain more celebrity, than his ancestors. He appears to have been one of the first laymen in Scotland who attained eminence, rather from political than military talents, and flourished in the reigns of James I. and his successor—a period, fertile in strange turns of fortune, of which our imperfect records have presented but a dubious history. Sir William de Crichton early attended the court, being one of the persons despatched to congratulate James I. on his marriage, and, on the king's return to Scotland, he became master of the royal household. Three years afterwards he was one of the envoys sent to treat for the establishment of a perpetual peace with Erick, king of

A. D. 1423.

A. D. 1426.

[1] Nisbet's *Remarks on Ragman's Roll, Heraldry*, vol. ii., p. 42.

[2] [See Bruce's *Travels in Abyssinia.*]

Denmark, and seems ever after to have been the personal favourite of his sovereign, and to have acted the part of a courtier and minister with an address then very unusual in Scotland. In justice to this statesman we ought to add, that to be the adherent of the crown during this period, was, in fact, to be the friend of civil liberty and of the free administration of justice. The people as yet did not exist as an order of the state, and the immediate oppressors of law and freedom were the band of aristocratic nobility, who set the laws of the kingdom and authority of the sovereign at equal defiance.

A. D. 1437. The sudden and violent death of James I. threw loose all the rules and bonds of government which his wisdom had begun to introduce; for it was ever the misfortune of Scotland, to lose her wisest and bravest rulers at the moment when she most needed them. The exorbitant power of the Douglasses outbalanced the feeble authority of an infant prince. But the wise policy of the parliament, while it named no noble of high rank to the office of regent, which the Earl of Douglas might have considered as an insult to himself, and avenged accordingly, assigned the management of the kingdom to Sir William Crichton, under the title of chancellor, and the custody of the king's person to Sir Alexander Livingston, a person of the same moderate station. It seems likely that the powerful feudal nobles were led thus to compromise their own claims in favour of two gentlemen of inferior rank, rather than run the risk of either placing Douglas in that high office,

or electing in his despite one of his own rank. The talents of both statesmen were highly esteemed, and their wisdom was considered a counterbalance to the great power of Douglas. In the meanwhile, they could not refuse him the dignity of lieutenant-general of the kingdom.

A. D. 1433. A dissension soon arose betwixt Livingstone and Crichton, the former alleging that the chancellor had deprived him of the custody of the king's person. The queen entered into the views of Livingston, and concealed her son in a chest, in which he was smuggled out of the Castle of Edinburgh, then in the power of the chancellor; and she herself accompanying him, under pretence of a pilgrimage to Whitekirk in Buchan, they landed safely at Stirling, the stronghold of his competitor.

The power of Douglas, who contemned and menaced both the chancellor and Livingston as low-born upstarts, compelled the chancellor and the guardian once more to unite their interests.

A second feud broke out between them, owing to the insolence of Livingston, who, as we learn from a curious and authentic chronicle of the

A. D. 1440. time, laid the person of the queen under arrest, forgetful of the advantage she had so lately procured him; threw into a dungeon her second husband, the Black Knight of Lorn, as he was called, and his brother, and *bollit, i. e.* fettered them.[1] Crichton, therefore, found it no difficult matter to reconcile himself with the queen-dowager,

[1] See *Ane Schort Memoriale of the Scottis Croniklis*, p. i.

through whose connivance he recovered the custody of the king's person, by a stratagem similar to that of Livingston. He surprised James while hunting in the Park at Stirling, and carried him off to Edinburgh, without any resistance offered by his attendants, or any reluctance shown on his own part. The estates of parliament interfered; the chancellor, with the Lord of the Isles, the Lord Gordon, and Sir Alexander Seton, became security for Sir James Stewart, and the governors were again reconciled; a truce which became fatal to the young heir of the house of Douglas.

This unfortunate nobleman was a youth of eighteen, and could, therefore, have committed no great personal aggressions against his country; he was high-spirited, gallant, and intelligent, and might have lived to do her service. But his house had possessed too much power, and his minority and inexperience gave the governors an opportunity to restrain it. Under the guise of seeming reconciliation, he was enticed to the Castle of Crichton, and there hospitably entertained,—an evident proof how deeply Sir William Crichton was concerned in the nefarious scene which followed. On the next morning the young Earl of Douglas was inveigled to the Castle of Edinburgh, then in possession of the lord chancellor. The mask of friendship and hospitality was then thrown aside. The earl was arrested in the presence of the young king, who wept bitterly, and besought his life in vain from his unrelenting guardians. After the mockery of a hasty trial, Douglas was dragged to an inner-court, and there beheaded,

A. D. 1440.

along with his brother, still younger than himself, and Fleming of Cumbernauld, their most determined adherent,—an act of detestable policy, which soon brought on the vengeance it deserved, and was long remembered and execrated in the popular rhyme,—

> "Edinborough castle, town, and tower,
> God grant you sink for sin,
> And that even for the black dinoure
> Earl Douglas gat therein."

The young king now appeared on the stage. He hated his chancellor and Livingstone, particularly the former. He united with the Earl of Douglas, successor to him who was murdered; and, in the turns of state which followed, Crichton was deprived of his office of chancellor, and summoned to appear and stand his trial. His answer showed a confidence which could only proceed from the secret countenance of many of the nobility, who hated the exorbitant power of the Douglasses. He avowed himself a true servant to the king, and willing to render an account of his administration, so soon as "the captain of thieves" was removed from the royal councils, and he had a prospect of a fair and just trial. In the meantime, although denounced a rebel by blast of horn, he defended himself both against the power of the king and that of Douglas, in the then almost impregnable Castle of Edinburgh, while his kindred and followers maintained themselves in other strong places in Lothian, and refused to render them to the royal authority. This was particularly the

A. D. 1444.

case with Barntoun, or Brunston, defended by one Andrew Crichton, who, when summoned by the Earl of Douglas, in name and behalf of the king, returned for answer, "that he had the keeping intrusted to him on the king's behalf by the sheriff, (Sir William Crichton,) to whom he had found security for safely keeping the same, and without whose order he would not deliver it. The event of this siege does not appear. Edinburgh Castle was beleaguered for nine months, and defended with an obstinate valour and success, which showed that Crichton was supported by many and powerful allies.

In the meanwhile, his paternal Castle of Crichton, the present subject of our local history, was stormed and taken by John Forester of Corstorphine, a dependent of the Earl of Douglas, by whose orders it is said to have been demolished, in resentment of the treacherous hospitality with which his kinsman had been feasted within its walls on the day before he was inveigled to Edinburgh and there executed. "He was scarce retired," says Hume of Godscroft, "when Crichton assembled his friends and followers, so suddenly as none could imagine, and foraged the lands of Corstorphine, together with the lands of Strabrock, Abercorn, and Blackness; and, amongst other goods, he drove away a race of mares that the Earl Douglas had brought from Flanders, which were kept in Abercorn; doing more harm than he had received." These alternate ravages, which took place in 1445, mark at once the spirit of the times and the power of Crichton, who could retaliate so for-

midably upon the dreaded Earl Douglas, even when armed with the royal authority.

A. D. 1446. At length, Edinburgh Castle being found too strong for the besiegers, Crichton yielded it up on an honourable compromise, with full security of his life and fortune; and thus, as an old historian expresses it, "leapt dry-shod" over a great danger. His colleague, Livingston, did not escape so clear, being imprisoned and forfeited; whence Mr Pinkerton conjectures, that Livingston had the greater share in the murder of the youthful Douglasses. The damning fact, however, remains, that they were feasted in Crichton Castle while they were trained on to their destruction; and John Major, in treating of that cruel murder, has these remarkable words:—"I have read in our annals, that these men were not guilty of any crime deserving death, but that the deed was perpetrated by the council or the guile of William Crichton, Chancellor of Scotland."[1]

It would therefore seem, that Crichton owed his safety to his high reputation for political talents, and his experience in state affairs. He was soon afterwards replaced in the office of chancellor, and sent to France, as one of the ambassadors, to renew the ancient league, and to choose a wife for the young king. Mary of Gueldres was selected on this occasion, and the services of the chancellor were rewarded by his elevation to the peerage by the title of Lord Crichton.

About 1450, when great discord and jealousy

[1] *Majoris Historia*, Ed. 1745, p. 322.

again arose betwixt the king and the Earl of Douglas, Crichton was supposed to have given his counsel for the utter ruin and destruction of that high-spirited, but turbulent house. His restoration, therefore, to political authority, renewed the slumbering ire of Douglas, whose commands at that time were so much more absolute than those of the Scottish monarch, that Pitscottie avers, that whoever slew or plundered at their bidding, was free from all risk of pursuit at the hands of public justice.

In a journey from Crichton Castle to Edinburgh, the chancellor, riding with a small train, fell into an ambush placed for his assassination. But remembering his ancient courage, and being well seconded by his son Sir James, he broke through the band by whom he was beset, slaying two, and wounding several, and escaped safe to his Castle of Crichton. To retaliate this injury, he gathered promptly a body of chosen retainers, and made so sudden an attack upon the Earl of Douglas, then residing in the town of Edinburgh, that he forced him in his turn to fly for his life.

A. D. 1452. Yet, notwithstanding these acts of mutual and aggravated hostility, we find the king of England granted a pass soon afterwards to the Earl of Douglas, Lord Crichton, and other persons of rank attached to both their factions, together with the Bishops of Glasgow, Moray, and Dunblane, and the Abbots of Melrose, Dunfermline, and Paisley, to perform in company a pilgrimage to the shrine of Thomas à Becket.[1] This passport

[1] Rymer's *Fœdera*, xi., p. 303.

had probably reference to some truce or league betwixt the parties, of which a pilgrimage was often the stipulated sanction. It does not appear that it was ever used.

It seems probable that the counsels of Crichton directed the desperate blow aimed at the power of the Douglasses, when James II. stabbed Earl William with his own hand in the Castle of Stirling. But the aged statesman was not in Stirling upon that memorable occasion. Godscroft insinuates that he had withdrawn to his own Castle under the pretended displeasure of the king, in order that the absence of an enemy so inveterate might more readily encourage Douglas to trust himself within the fatal fortress. The deed was, at all events, in conformity with the sagacious, but unscrupulous advice of Crichton, who had ever recommended that the king should take all occasions, and every possible means, for destroying the family of Douglas.

In 1455, this active and experienced minister was summoned from the stage on which he had so long performed a bustling and important part. He was a consummate statesman, according to the manners of the age, and appears, from the firmness with which he encountered, baffled, and retaliated the injuries of the Douglasses, to have possessed a power corresponding far more to his wisdom and experience than his wealth or family, although the one became extensive and the other was honourable. He was cautious without timidity, and enterprising without rashness, seldom failing in any of his undertakings, and always able to extricate

himself from their more perilous consequences. But we are compelled to record, that this sagacious statesman was as destitute of faith, mercy, and conscience, as of fear and of folly.

Sir William Crichton left issue, by Agnes his wife; namely, Sir James, his son and heir, also two daughters, Elizabeth, married to Alexander, first Earl of Huntly, and Agnes, to Alexander Lord Glamis. Sir James Crichton, his son, was styled commonly, in the lifetime of his father, by the title of Frendraught, an extensive property in Aberdeenshire, which he obtained by marriage with Janet, the eldest of the two daughters and co-heirs of James Dunbar, Earl of Murray.

A. D. 1469. William, third Lord Crichton, the son of Lord James, succeeded him in his estate and dignities in 1469. This nobleman engaged in the great conspiracy of the Duke of Albany, in 1483, for dethroning James III. If Buchanan, always hostile to the family of Stuart, can be credited, there subsisted betwixt the king and Lord Crichton mutual injuries, of a dye too deep to be effaced or forgotten. James, says the historian, had seduced the beautiful wife of Lord Crichton,—a noble matron, he terms her, of the family of Dunbar; which gives some reason to believe he confounds Lord Crichton's wife with her mother. In resentment of this domestic injury, Crichton retaliated the disgrace by forming an intrigue with Margaret, sister to the Scottish monarch, whom Buchanan brands as the incestuous concubine of her own brother.

If Crichton was really thus situated respecting

his sovereign, it is no wonder that, from fear as well as resentment, he should have engaged in a plot for his overthrow. The timely discovery of Albany's conspiracy rendered its execution impossible. Crichton garrisoned his castle, and fled to England. Doom of forfeiture passed against him in the Scottish Parliament, 24th February, 1483-4, for aiding and abetting the Duke of Albany in his treasonable correspondence with England, maintained through the means of Bluemantle, an English pursuivant-at-arms; and also for traitorously garrisoning and defending his Castle of Crichton, and supporting and maintaining those who held it out against the royal authority.

A. D. 1483-4.

The Castle and Barony of Crichton were, upon the forfeiture of William Lord Crichton, granted to Sir John Ramsay, a minion of James III. He had been numbered among the royal favourites as early as 1481, when Cochrane and others, whom the nobility accounted as intruders on the king's confidence, were hanged over the Bridge of Lauder, by Archibald, Earl of Angus, called Bell-the-Cat. This Sir John Ramsay escaped the general doom of the royal minions, by leaping on horseback behind the king, and clasping him round the body. His youth, and the king's earnest entreaties, saved him from the common fate; and he probably became still dearer to James, from the danger which he had incurred in the royal presence for his supposed attachment to the king's person. He was called to parliament as a peer by the title of Lord Bothwell, was made treasurer

A. D. 1484.

of the kingdom, and enjoyed other offices of high power and trust, as well as the king's entire confidence. But his greatness was of brief duration.

In the meanwhile, William, the hereditary Lord of Crichton, pined in exile, from which he is said to have been recalled under the following circumstances:—The Lady of Crichton, says Buchanan, died soon after her husband's flight to England; and the king, desirous to hide the disgrace of his favourite sister, who was almost frantic for the loss of her paramour, recalled Crichton from banishment, on condition of his marrying the Princess Margaret. They were wedded accordingly, and Crichton seems to have obtained restitution of that part of his fortune which descended to him by his mother, the Barony of Frendraught, namely, in the North, which from this time became his residence, and that of his successors. Crichton was reconciled to the king, and admitted to his presence at Inverness, during an expedition which James made towards the North near the conclusion of his reign. He therefore entertained hopes of obtaining a full pardon, but neither of the brothers-in-law long survived the interview. Crichton died at Inverness, where, according to Buchanan, his monument was extant in the time of the historian. It seems uncertain whether the son who survived William Lord Crichton was the child of the Princess Margaret; but he left a daughter, their undoubted issue, who became Countess of Rothes.

Thus fell the House of Crichton, at least as proprietors of their native castle and barony

Their honours revived in the county of Aberdeen, where they became Viscounts of Frendraught; and in Dumfries-shire, where a branch attained the honour of Lord Crichtons of Sanquhar, and afterwards became Earls of Dumfries. Both families flourished during the independence of Scotland; that of Frendraught was ruined from their attachment to the House of Stuart; that of Dumfries has merged in the Marquisate of Bute. Each family has various legends belonging to its history, of such mystery and horror, as if the subtle and intriguing genius of the Lord Chancellor had influenced the fate of his descendants. The strange tale of the burning of Frendraught's Castle, where his guests, Lord Aboyne and Gordon of Rothemay, perished in the flames, may be found in Spalding's Account of the Troubles of Scotland. The fate of Lord Sanquhar, executed for the assassination of a fencing-master called Turner, was not less extraordinary.[1] And the story of the Admirable Crichton is too well known to be repeated. The following tragedy, so strikingly illustrative of the savage manners of Scotland during the 16th century, is less generally known.

When the Reformation began first to be fiercely agitated in Scotland, during the regency of the Duke of Chatelherault, a strong debate took place in the house and presence of the regent betwixt the favourers of the new and of the ancient faith. Among the former was the A. D. 1552.

[1] See *ante*, vol. vi., p. 123.

third Lord Semple; and one of the keenest of the latter was William, third Lord Crichton of Sanquhar. The theological debate betwixt them waxed so high, that Semple, as a last and indisputable argument, drew his dagger and stabbed Crichton to the heart, his life-blood wetting the garment of the governor of the kingdom, in whose presence he was thus cruelly murdered;—a deed, says Balfour, for which Semple would have lost his head, but for the intercession of his friends, and compensation made to the Crichtons. If the sins of the fathers are visited upon their children, a judgment might be read in the fate of this unfortunate nobleman, thus perishing by violence, like the two murdered Earls of Douglas, in the very presence of that royal authority which ought to have been his protection. But, in fact, it was rather the virtues of this devoted family and name, than the faults of their ancestors, which precipitated their ruin.

In imitation of their founder, the Crichtons in general attached themselves to the Crown of Scotland, which was at all times far too weak to protect its adherents; and they may in general be considered as victims to their loyalty. The persevering enmity of the Douglasses seems to have been taken up and prosecuted by the reformers; and the attachment of the gentlemen of the name to the unhappy causes of Mary, Charles I., Charles II., and James II., completed the ruin of the greater part of them. At one time, there were more than thirty landed gentlemen of the name of Crichton, possessing extensive estates in Lothian,

and in the shires of Perth, Aberdeen, Caithness, Stirling, Ayr, Dumfries, and Galloway, besides minor establishments in Clackmannan, Renfrew, Lanark, and Berwick shires. The females married into the Houses of Rothes, Seton, Gray, Oliphant, Stewart, and others of the first rank; and one of their barons, as we have seen, became nearly allied to the crown. In the present day, exclusive of the Marquis of Bute, there can scarce be numbered three landed gentlemen of a family once so powerful; and even the very name has become rare in the shires where it was once most numerous. Two or three respectable families found refuge among the citizens of Edinburgh; and we may particularly notice that of Patrick Crichton, Esq., Gayfield Place, who has obliged us by pointing out many particulars respecting his name and clan.—We return from the history of the Crichton family to that of the castle and barony.

The defeat and death of James III. involved the ruin of the favourite Ramsay, A. D. 1488. Earl of Bothwell, who had inherited the spoils of Lord Crichton. He in his turn was proscribed, exiled, and forfeited. He was afterwards permitted to return to Scotland,[1] where he acted the part of an obscure and traitorous spy for the English monarch, and died about 1513.

The castle and lordship of Crichton, of which Ramsay had been for a short time possessed, was now granted anew to a noble more powerful and

[1] See Pinkerton's History, vol. ii., p. 27.

as daringly ambitious as the sagacious Chancellor; and, as the latter had raised himself by the cruel murder of the Douglasses, the now possessor of these fated domains founded his claim on the slaughter of a king.

King James III., as is well known to the readers of Scottish history, was dethroned and slain by a confederacy among the Scottish nobles of the South, the Homes and Hepburns holding the principal rank among the conspirators. The chiefs of these great clans were offended that the Priory of Coldinghame, to which a prior had always been appointed out of one or other of their names, should have been annexed by the king to his chapel-royal at Stirling. On this quarrel they headed the revolt, in which the unfortunate king was defeated and slain at the battle of Sauchie Burn, near Stirling, 18th June, 1488.

Patrick Hepburn, chief of that name, and the third Lord Hales, led the vanguard at that battle; and James IV., though he is supposed to have detested the treason exercised against his father, and certainly did penance for his own involuntary share in it, was compelled to reward the ringleaders, as if it had been the most acceptable service. Lord Hales, in particular, was loaded with honours and donations, and obtained the forfeited estates of Ramsay, Lord Bothwell, the favourite of James III. Ramsay's doom was pronounced upon the 6th October, 1488; and upon the 13th of the same month, the castles and estates both of Bothwell and Crichton were bestowed upon Hep-

burn. Ramsay was forfeited for contumacy and non-appearance. But in other cases we find "the great and high displeasure which our noble lord had taken against them that were of that ilk opinion, and in field at Stirling against him, contrary to the common good of the realm, and destruction of the same, thereby becoming the cause of the slaughter and death of the late king," alleged as sufficient reasons for severely punishing those who had aided James III. against his insurgent nobles. —Certainly the wolf in the fable brought his accusation against the sheep on more plausible grounds.

Ramsay's forfeiture was a part, but not the whole, of the recompense received by Hepburn, Lord Hales, for being of "that other opinion;" a partaker, namely, with the heir-apparent in the insurrection against the reigning sovereign. Mr Wood, to whose care and industry we owe an edition of Douglas's Peerage of Scotland, more valuable than the original work, has thus enumerated the favours bestowed on that powerful noble:—

"He had letters under the Great Seal of the keeping of the Castle of Edinburgh, with 300 merks of the customs of the city, and the office of sheriff-principal of the county of Edinburgh, and within the constabulary of Haddington, 26th June, 1488. He had also the office of the master of the household, and was constituted high admiral of Scotland for life, 10th September, 1488 He had a charter of the Lordship of Crichton Castle, including Vogry, Sauchnell, the Foord and Mill, Capriston, Murehouse, Castlelaw, the woods of Crichton, the advowson of the collegiate

church of that place, in the county of Edinburgh; the baronies of Drysdale and Kirkmichael, in Dumfries-shire, and the lordship of Bothwell, with the advowson of the provostry thereof, in the county of Lanark, forfeited by John Ramsay, formerly called Lord Bothwell, 13th October, 1488. Four days afterwards, the king was pleased to erect the lordship of Bothwell into an earldom, and to annex thereto the lordship of Crichton, with the right of patronage of the collegiate churches of these places, fishings in the Clyde, and forty merks of land of the Forest of Bothwell, and to confer it on Lord Hales, for his fidelity, and in compensation of the expense, damage, and danger, he had undergone in his majesty's service, creating him Earl of Bothwell in full parliament, by girding him with a sword. The same day it was declared in parliament, that Patrick Lord Hales, master of household to the king, who has the keeping of the Castle of Edinburgh, should have the rule and government of James, Duke of Ross, his majesty's brother."[1]

The second Earl of Bothwell, who succeeded to his father in his estates, as well as in most of these high dignities, was killed, valiantly fighting by the side of his sovereign in the fatal field of Flodden. His death is thus described by the English poet who celebrates that event:— A. D. 1513.

> "But on the Scottish part right proud,
> The Earl of Bothwell then out brast;

[1] Wood's edition of Douglas's Peerage, vol. i., p. 225.

And stepping forth with stomach good,
Into the enemy's throng he thrast.

" And ' Bothwell, Bothwell!' cried bold,
To cause his soldiers to ensue;
But there he catcht a welcome cold,
The Englishmen straight down him threw.

" Thus Haburn through his hardy heart
His fatal fine in conflict found;
Now all this while, on either part,
Were dealt full many a deadly wound." [1]

Patrick, the young Earl of Bothwell, who succeeded to his father, nourished the same ambition which devoured both the soul and body of his unfortunate son James, who, to their mutual misfortune, became the husband of Mary Stuart. The father was a candidate for the favour of Mary of Guise while queen-dowager of Scotland, and his rival in her grace was Matthew Stuart, fourth Earl of Lennox, afterwards regent of Scotland, and slain at the Raid of Stirling, in 1571. The narrative of Pitscottie presents, with his usual picturesque simplicity, the persons of the candidates, and the arts by which two lovers of such high rank endeavoured at that period to win the affections of a queen. We have, for the sake of being intelligible, discarded the rude orthography of the period, retaining, at the same time, the precise words of the historian.

" The Earl of Bothwell was at this tyme ane lustie young gentleman, and had a good presence

[1] *Flodden Field*, a poem edited by Henry Weber, 8vo, Edinburgh, 1808, p. 111.

in the sight of women, whereby he intended to have the queen in marriage, as the Earl of Lennox did; and daily these two young lords pursued the court and queen with great *bravitie*[1] and costly cloathing, contending who should be most *galliyart*[2] in their *abullyeamentis*,[3] renewing the same every day, and in using all kinds of plays, and exercise on horse and foot, that became noblemen to do; and specially who might behave themselves best in the Queen's sight, in dancing, *louping*,[4] or any other games, &c. But the Earl of Lennox *warred*[5] the Earl of Bothwell at sundry games, for he was brought up in the wars of France, whilk learned him the feats of arms, and to exercise his pith to the uttermost. For the Earl of Lennox was a strong man, of personage well proportioned in all his members, with lustie and manly visage, and went very straight up in his *passage*;[6] wherefore he appeared very pleasant in the sight of gentlewomen. As for the Earl of Bothwell, he was faire and whitelie, hanging-shouldered, and went something forward, with a gentle, humane countenance. These two gentlemen daily frequenting the court, and exercising themselves in this form, every one of them behoved to obtain his purpose at the Queen's hand; but she did nothing but gave them fair words, that they might serve her till she saw her time expedient to give them answer. But at last these two lords, being a great space at court,

[1] Splendour of dress, bravery. [2] Gallant. [3] Accoutrements.
[4] Leaping. [5] Put to the worse; *i. e.* overcame.
[6] His gait or demeanour, from *passager*. A Gallicism.

which was great cost to themselves, kin, and friends, ever in readiness to do the Queen service, which at last the Earl of Bothwell *inlaiked expensis*,[1] and passed home, till he saw farther about him."[2]

Popular tradition says, that among other feats of gallantry by which Bothwell endeavoured to excel his rival Lennox, he upon one occasion pushed his horse down a very steep part of the Calton Hill, in order to take part in a tournament held near the Greenside-well. Sometimes this feat is (with much less probability) ascribed to his son Earl James, while paying his court to the unfortunate Mary.

Being disappointed in this fruitless rivalry, Patrick Earl of Bothwell seems to have been through the rest of his life ranked with the malecontent nobles, of whom Scotland always exhibited too numerous a band. On the 12th December, 1544, he was arraigned of high treason, of unlawful intercourse with England and her invading army, and of taking prisoner Peter Thomson, Bute pursuivant at arms, stripping him of the Queen's letters, which he was about to execute in the course of his duty at the market-cross of Haddington, and imprisoning him in his Castle of Crichton, and elsewhere. The Earl was acquitted of this charge, but appears never to have been reconciled to the court.[3]

He died in 1556, and was succeeded by his son,

[1] Run short of means to maintain his expense.

[2] Chronicles of Scotland, by Pitscottie. Dalyell's edit. vol ii., p. 422.

[3] See Chalmers's *Life of Queen Mary*, vol. ii., p. 209.

the famous, or rather infamous, James Earl of Bothwell, to write whose history would be to write that of Scotland at the same period. During his time, the Castle of Crichton was probably witness to many a gay revel, and many a dark conspiracy. From several passages in Chalmers's very elaborate and interesting Life of Queen Mary, it seems to have been his principal residence. In 1559, when Bothwell seized upon a subsidy of 4000 crowns, sent by Elizabeth to maintain the affairs of the Congregation, or Protestant Lords, the Earl of Arran, and Lord James Stewart, (afterward Earl of Murray,) instantly rode to Crichton with four hundred horse, followed by three hundred foot, and "certain pieces of ordnance," to recover the treasure. But Bothwell had already escaped with the gold upon a horse, without saddle, boot, or spur. The castle was yielded up without opposition, and garrisoned by the Lords of the Congregation with fifty hagbutters. In 1561, Lord John Stewart, a natural brother of Queen Mary, was married at Crichton Castle, the queen being herself present, and "much good sport and many pastimes there were," as Randolph reported to Cecil.[1] The castle was now, indeed, fitter for the purposes of splendour and festivity than those of war. It lay too near Edinburgh, and, as had been already proved, artillery might at any time be brought against it, and placed so as to command it from the heights to the southward. Crichton, therefore, was by no

[1] Chalmers's *Life of Queen Mary*, vol. ii., p. 212.

means so strong a hold as the Castle of Hermitage in Liddesdale, or that of Dunbar on the coast. which were Bothwell's most favourite places of refuge. It is unnecessary to trace his wretched and most melancholy history. His connexion with Crichton Castle was closed by a doom of forfeiture. dated 29th December, 1567.

Bothwell's doom of outlawry vested Crichton a third time in the crown, and the facile liberality of James VI. again conferred it on a kinsman, as unscrupulously ambitious as Chancellor Crichton, as profligate as his grandson, as treacherous as Ramsay, and as turbulent, traitorous, and seditious as all the Hepburns of Bothwell. This hopeful personage was Francis Stewart, Earl of Bothwell, son of the Prior of Coldinghame, who was a natural son of James V. His claims upon the earldom of Bothwell, so incautiously sanctioned by James, were in virtue of his mother, Lady Jean Hepburn, daughter of Patrick, third Earl of Bothwell.

After several acts of private violence, the new Lord of Crichton Castle became an open rebel to his sovereign. From 1591, when, having consulted some wizards concerning the king's death, he was committed to the castle of Edinburgh, until 1594, when he was forced to fly from Scotland; he was engaged in a constant train of conspiracies, insurrections, and enterprises, open or concealed, against the person of his benefactor James. After lurking some time in England, he escaped abroad, embraced the Catholic faith to obtain a precarious subsistence, and died in poverty, notwithstanding his supposed

skill in the occult sciences,[1] and admitted dexterity in the use of arms.[2]

[1] In Spain, the exiled Earl of Bothwell had nearly fallen under the power of the Inquisition; amongst other reasons, because, "by taking upon him to tell fortunes, and help men to goods purloined, he incurred the suspicion of a sorcerer." WINWOOD'S *Memorials*, vol. ii., p. 108. George Sandys, the traveller, found him in Italy, in full possession of necromantic fame. "A certain Calabrian," he says, "hearing that I was an Englishman, came to me, and would needs persuade me that I had insight in magic; for that Earl Bothwell was my countryman, who lives at Naples, and is in these parts famous for suspected necromancie. He told me that he had treasure hidden in his house, the quantity and qualitie shown him by a boy, upon conjuration of a Knight of Malta, and offered to share it between us, if I could help him to it. But I answered, that in England we were at defiance with the devill, and that he would do nothing for us."—SANDYS' *Journey*, 1627, p. 250. Thus it seems that Bothwell was to the very last a dupe to those vain and mystical researches, which first occasioned his falling under his sovereign's displeasure. In the Introduction to Law's *Memorials*, Mr C. Kirkpatrick Sharpe, whose indefatigable researches have collected such curious illustrations of his author, has shown that Bothwell's son was, like his father, a student of the occult sciences, and was present with Sir Kenelm Digby when the devil carried off a conjurer, who, being unfortunately overtaken with liquor, had neglected to propitiate with proper suffumigations the spirits whom he invoked.—LAW'S *Memorials, Introduction*, p. xliii. *note*. The truth is, to use honest Evelyn's words, Sir Kenelm was an arrant mountebank.

[2] The reader may be amused with the rhodomontades of Sir Thomas Urquhart of Cromarty concerning Lord Bothwell, whom he leaves, so far as skill and bravery in arms were concerned, not a jot behind his more celebrated theme of eulogy, the Admirable Crichton. The Earl of Bothwell was, according to his learned countrymen, a terror to the most desperate duellists of Europe, and a subduer of the proudest champions, both Turks and Christians; the gasconades of France, the rhodomontades of Spain, fanfaronades of Italy,

The forfeiture of Francis Earl of Bothwell's large estates became a prey to others. Buccleuch,

and braggadocio brags of all other countries, no more astonished his invincible heart, than would the cheeping of a mouse conjure down the fury of a bear robbed of her whelps. Not to mention his conquest over a strong and warlike Mahometan, who had appealed, like a second Goliah, the whole champions of Christendom to enter the lists with him, Sir Thomas Urquhart affirms, that Bothwell would VERY OFTEN, in the presence of ladies whose intimate favourite he was, give some proof of the undauntedness of his courage, and by the mere activity of his body, with the help of a single sword, *set upon a lion in his greatest fierceness, and kill him dead upon the place.* After this, the reader will not be startled to find, that, by way of pastime, he was wont to set upon some ten or twelve swordsmen at once, and lay such thick and threefold load upon them, that he quickly made them betake themselves to their heels. Nor will he be much surprised at the author's apprehension that the history of the banished earl may appear to future ages but as a romance of chivalry, and draw as little faith as those of Amadis or Esplandian.—*Tracts, by* SIR THOMAS URQUHART, *Edin.* 1782, p. 53.

Notwithstanding the exaggerations of Sir Thomas Urquhart, which throw discredit upon truth itself, Bothwell was, to use Sir Toby's phrase, "a very devil in private brawl," and divorced various souls and bodies. But his life, while abroad, was as contemptible and licentious as it had been ambitious and turbulent while in his native country. See the Letters of Sir Charles Cornwallis, in Winwood's *Memorials,* vol. ii. pp. 108, 325, 441, 442. From these passages, the reader will learn what sort of damsels those were for whose sake the Earl achieved his deeds of chivalry, besides coming to great and divers losses, which the ambassador reports to the court of London. The cause assigned for Bothwell's death is as singular as any part of his wild and harebrained career. Sir Dudley Carleton writes to Trumble, the English Resident at Brussels, upon the 16th January, 1612: —"You will have heard of the death of the Lord Bothwell at Naples, and what cost and ceremony the Spaniards used at his funerall. But the occasion, it may be, will seem strange

and Kerr of Cessford, had the greatest share. Crichton castle and barony, with Hales, and the Lordship of Liddesdale, were granted to Sir Walter Scott, the step-son of the forfeited Earl of Bothwell, and were inherited by his son Francis, second Earl of Buccleuch, who was served heir, on 27th February, 1634, to his father Walter, the first Earl, son of the grantee. Charles I., however, with more regard to equity and humanity than

unto you; it being most certaine, that the news of our prince's (*i. e.* Prince Henry's) death struck him with such a sudden melancholy, that he took his chamber thereupon, and, without speech with any man, (though many came to him to offer him all possible comfort) he died within three or four days after. What may we imagine would have been performed by that prince, if it had pleased God he had lived, since his ashes have wrought such an effect upon a man of so strong a mind, who had been the instrument of so much trouble to his father? And yet towards his end, I understand, he was so dutifully affected towards his majesty, that he was heard often to say, he would go into England and crave pardon of him, though he were sure to lose his head the next day."—WINWOOD'S *Memorials*, vol. iii., p. 424. From this account it would seem, that the death of Bothwell was hastened, if not absolutely occasioned, by the premature fate of Henry, the hopeful Prince of Wales. To this prince, of a character so different from his father, clung the hopes of Raleigh, Southampton, and many others, who had either incurred James's displeasure, or who disapproved of his government. Among others, it seems probable that the exiled earl, whose life shows him to have been "of imagination all compact," had formed some fantastic hopes of emerging from his difficulties by the favour of a prince known to love arms, and those who could use them. The disappointment operating on a mind broken by disasters, and a frame enfeebled by debauchery, will afford an adequate cause for the inconsolable melancholy which hastened the death of the last distinguished Lord of Crichton Castle.

policy, had early manifested a desire to resume these large grants, at least in part, and to confer them upon the son of the forfeited earl.

This was Francis Stuart, who obtained a rehabilitation under the great seal, confirmed by Parliament in 1633, against his father's forfeiture. Thus restored in blood, he proceeded to act against the possessors of his father's estates. He found Cessford, now Earl of Roxburgh, tractable, but Walter Earl of Buccleuch, extremely restive. Charles took Stuart's part in the affair, which so greatly incensed the Earl of Buccleuch, then in service in the Low Countries, that he is said to have uttered threatening expressions against the king, as appears in the course of that mysterious procedure, which, in 1631, was near being decided by judicial combat betwixt Donald Lord Reay and Sir David Ramsay. Stuart pressed his suit against Earl Francis of Buccleuch, then a minor, with such favour from the king, and with such success, that it was subiected by reference to Charles's arbitration, who assigned to Stuart the whole estates in Mid-Lothian, although Liddesdale remained in the Buccleuch family.

This act of resumption added a very powerful family, with their numerous kindred and followers, to the king's enemies during the civil wars. Buccleuch levied a strong regiment of his clan for the service of the Parliament against the king, who did good service at Newcastle, Longmarston-moor, and particularly at Philiphaugh. Bishop Guthrie repeatedly notices the inveteracy of this house and

name against King Charles, which had its source in this impolitic restitution.

Neither did Francis Stuart profit by the estates thus restored to him. He had been a man of dissolute life and large expense, and they passed into the hands of his creditors, without his receiving any advantage from them. He left a son, who, according to Scotstarvet, was the same Francis Stuart that was so far reduced as to ride a private trooper in the Life-Guards. He is mentioned in the Memoirs of Captain Creightoun, but is perhaps better known as the Bothwell of the popular novel called Old Mortality. Stuart was not, however, slain at the skirmish of Drumclog, as is represented in that tale, but was present as a captain of cavalry at the battle of Bothwell Bridge. Mr Wood, in his edition of Douglas's Peerage, contends, that Francis Stuart, the trooper, was the nephew of the restored son of Bothwell. But, at all events, the latter's son, called Charles, seems to have been an obscure soldier as well as his cousin, unless he has been accidentally confounded with him. In such utter obscurity terminated, in the fifth generation, a line directly descended from the kings of Scotland.

Crichton Castle, which had so often changed masters in consequence of important revolutions in the state, and witnessed so many instances of human instability, was after this period transferred from hand to hand, according to the ordinary changes of property, which it is less interesting to trace. Its previous history strongly illustrates the versatility

of human affairs, and the peculiar mutability of the turbulent politics of Scotland, where it became matter of proverbial remark, that no family of preponderating distinction usually throve beyond the third generation.

When fortunes began to be acquired by commerce, properties situated like Crichton, in the county of Edinburgh, changed owners with a frequency which surprised and somewhat scandalized the gentry of the more remote counties. As the opportunities of acquiring land were in the neighbourhood of the metropolis relatively frequent, the temptations to profuse expense were equally so. Hence the proverb, that burgesses' heirs seldom thrive beyond the fourth generation, and another, which runs thus:—

> "The grandsire buys, the father biggs;[1]
> The son sells, the grandson thiggs."[2]

To both these adages there are many honourable exceptions; but, of course, most of the properties near Edinburgh changed masters frequently, when land became the subject of ordinary commerce.

The following were the transmissions of the Castle and Barony of Crichton, so far as we have been able to trace them. In the time of Scotstarvet they were in possession of one Dr Seaton, as having right from the creditors of Francis Stuart, from whom it seems to have been acquired by Hepburn of Humbie, perhaps as a trustee for the said creditors. It was A. D. 1649.

[1] Builds. [2] Begs.

sold about thirty years afterwards to Primrose of Carrington, ancestor of the family of Roseberry, and, in about forty years more, was alienated by Primrose to Sir James Justuss, of Justuss-Hall. With him the castle did not long remain, being conveyed in trust to one Livingstone, who sold it to Pringle Haining. He again sold it to Patrick Ross, from whose trustees it was bought by Alexander Callander, Esq. He was succeeded by the late Sir John Callander, and the estate is now possessed by Sir John's heir of entail, J. A. Higgins, Esq. of Higgins-Nooke.[1]

A. D. 1682.

A. D. 1724.

A. D. 1739.

A. D. 1786.

Having finished the history of the possessors of Crichton Castle, it remains to notice the building itself.

A stately quadrangle, surrounded by buildings of various ages and distinct characters, in which we can trace something of the change of possessors which this castle has undergone. All are totally ruinous.

In the north-west angle of the quadrangle, is a small keep, or donjon-tower, which seems to have been the habitation of the Crichtons, ere the talents of the chancellor elevated his family above the rank of lesser barons or gentry. If their consequence had never swelled beyond the accommodations which that rude tower afforded, in all probability it would have remained theirs for some centuries longer. The chancellor, doubtless,

[1] Chalmers's *Caledonia*, vol. ii., p. 819. [The possessor now, 1834, is William Burn Callander, Esq.]

added considerably to his paternal fortalice; and the buildings immediately adjacent on the east seem to be of the period of James II. We are, indeed, told by our historians, that the castle of the chancellor was demolished by Douglas in 1445; but when this phrase occurs, it is usually to be understood with much modification. The extreme thickness of the walls of a Scottish castle, defied any hasty application of force, and the actual demolition was a work both of time and expense. Thus, when it was resolved, in 1409, to raze the Castle of Jedburgh, as affording too convenient a stronghold to the English, it was agitated in the Scottish Parliament, that a tax of two pennies upon every hearth in the kingdom, should be employed to defray the charge. When we read, therefore, in Scottish history, of a fortress being demolished, it frequently means only that it was laid waste and dismantled. Such must have been the case with Crichton; for had it been razed totally in 1445, it could hardly, in 1451, have been so completely rebuilt, as to afford refuge to its master when pursued by the bands of Douglas. The size, also, and style of building of the tower on the north-western angle, show that it has been erected before the rest of the castle. Its antiquity, therefore, will probably draw back to the fourteenth century.

It is not so easy to assign a precise date to other parts of the castle; but the eastern side is the most modern, as well as the most beautiful, and offers an example of splendid architecture very unusual in Scottish castles. The inner front, as represented in the engraving, rises above a piazza

running the whole length of the front, the pillars of which have their capitals richly decorated with anchors entwined with cables. This favourite ornament inclines us to refer the building to one of the Earls of Bothwell, who were High Admirals of Scotland; and we are disposed to assign the work to the splendour of Earl Patrick, whose taste for magnificence has been already commemorated. Above the portico, the stones of the whole front are cut into diamond facets, the angular projections of which produce a variety of light and shade, and give a varied, rich, and beautiful effect to the building. The interior corresponds to the external elegance of the structure. The first floor seems to have been occupied by a magnificent gallery or banqueting-room, well lighted, and running the whole length of the front, to which access was formerly given by a stately staircase, which is now entirely demolished. The soffits of this staircase have been ornamented with cordage and rosettes, carved in freestone; and the whole might afford admirable hints for the modern Gothic, now so frequently employed in architecture. The plainer and less interesting parts of the castle contain such a variety of halls and chambers, as shows the power of the baron, and the number of his followers. The kitchen, which is in the north-eastern angle of the castle, corresponds in gloomy magnitude to the rest of the building.

In a large stone-chimney in one of the apartments, a flat arch is formed of freestones very ingeniously dovetailed into each other.

We must not omit to mention the dungeon, a

horrible vault, only accessible by a square hole in the roof, through which captives were lowered into this den of darkness and oblivion. This pit is termed the Massiemore, a name of Eastern origin. It is still applied to the dungeons of the ancient Moorish castles in Spain, and occurs twice in the "*Epistolæ Itinerariæ*" of Tollius:—"*Carcer subterraneus, sive, ut Mauri appellant,* MAZMORRA," p. 147; and again, "*Coguntur omnes captivi sub noctem in ergastula subterranea, quæ Turcæ Algezerani vocant* MAZMORRAS," p. 243.

[1] ["That castle rises on the steep
Of the green vale of Tyne:
And far beneath, where slow they creep,
From pool to eddy, dark and deep,
Where alders moist, and willows weep,
You hear her streams repine.
The towers in different ages rose;
Their various architecture shows
The builders' various hands;
A mighty mass, that could oppose,
When deadliest hatred fired its foes,
The vengeful Douglas bands.

"Crichton! though now thy miry court
But pens the lazy steer and sheep,
Thy turrets rude, and totter'd keep,
Have been the minstrel's loved resort.
Oft have I traced within thy fort,
Of mouldering shields the mystic sense
Scutcheons of honour, or pretence,
Quarter'd in old armorial sort,
Remains of rude magnificence.
Nor wholly yet had time defac'd
Thy lordly gallery fair;
Nor yet the stony cord unbraced
Whose twisted notes with roses laced,
Adorn thy ruin'd stair.
Still rises unimpaired below
The court-yard's graceful portico;
Above its cornice, row and row
Of fair hewn facets richly show
Their pointed diamond form,

Pennant slightly hints, that a person of rank was formerly lowered into the Massiemore of Crichton Castle for having failed to pay his respects to the lord in passing through his domains. The detailed tradition is as follows:—In Scotland, formerly, as still in some parts of Greece, the great chieftains required, as an acknowledgment of their authority, that those who passed through their lands should repair to their castle to explain the purpose of their journey, and receive the hospitality suited to their rank. To neglect this, was held discourtesy in the great, and insolence in the inferior traveller; and so strictly was the etiquette insisted on by some feudal lords, that the Lord Oliphant is said to have had guns planted at his Castle of Newtyle, in Angus-shire, so as to command the high-road, and to compel all restive passengers to do this act of homage.

It chanced when such ideas were predominant, that the Lord of Crichton Castle received intelligence that a Southern chieftain of high rank, some say Scott of Buccleuch, was to pass his dwelling on his return from court. The Lord of Crichton made great preparation to banquet his expected guest, who nevertheless rode past the castle without paying the expected visit. In his first burst

> Though there but houseless cattle go
> To shield them from the storm.
> And, shuddering, still may we explore,
> Where oft whilom were captives pent,
> The darkness of thy Massy More;
> Or from thy grass-grown battlement,
> May trace, in undulating line,
> The sluggish mazes of the Tyne."
>
> *Marmion*, canto iv., st. 10, 11.]

of indignation, the baron pursued the discourteous traveller with a body of horse, made him prisoner, and confined him in the dungeon, while he himself and his vassals feasted upon the good cheer which had been provided. With the morning, however, came reflection, and anxiety for the desperate feud which impended as the necessary consequence of his rough proceeding. It is said, that, by way of *amende honorable*, the baron, upon the second day, placed his compelled guest in his seat of honour in the hall, while he himself retired to his own dungeon, and thus did at once penance for his rashness, satisfied the honour of the stranger chief, and put a stop to the feud which otherwise must have taken place between them.

Ere taking leave of these ruins, there may be mentioned a whimsical circumstance which occurred there, about thirty years since, during a fox-chase, and is described by an eyewitness. Reynard, hard pressed by the Dalkeith pack, took refuge in the ruins of Crichton Castle, with the recesses of which he had probably been long acquainted. The hounds followed in full cry, and wakened the slumbering echoes of the vaults, halls, and chambers, with sounds very different from those to which they had replied during the feudal festivals of the Crichtons and the Bothwells. In the midst of a clamour, which was multiplied tenfold by the reverberation of the ruins, the fox was seen to leap from a small window about ten or twelve feet from the ground, and make the best of his way for the neighbouring cover. The hounds speedily found out the mode of Reynard's retreat;

but, as only one could pass through the opening at a time, it was one of the strangest sights possible to see them tumble successively, dog after dog, like a stream, or rather cascade, composed of living creatures, each eagerly resuming the pursuit as he touched the ground, while those that were detained within expressed their rage and impatience by the eagerness of their continued clamours. The fox, however, had by his finesse gained so far the advantage, that he reached the cover on the banks of the stream, and the hounds were thrown out.

Upon the whole, these romantic ruins are well leserving a visit, whether from the antiquary, the admirer of the picturesque, or he who seeks the scenes of historical events, as fittest to convey subjects of grave contemplation, and cherish the remembrance of days which are gone by.

Before leaving the subject of Crichton Castle, it is proper to notice the neighbouring Collegiate Church, which is represented in a slight engraving taken from the south-west. It was originally a rectory, rated in the ancient *Taxatio* at 30 merks, and received its collegiate foundation from Chancellor Crichton, out of thankfulness and gratitude to Almighty God for all the manifold deliverances he had vouchsafed to him. So Crawford the genealogist says, "ought to be presumed, and so he verily believes;" leaving, of course, the more uncharitable few, to impute either superstition, hypocrisy, or a political wish to gratify the church, as the ruling motive of the veteran statesman. The foundation is endowed,—"*In laudem et honorem* DEI *Omnipotentis, et Domini nostri* JESU CHRISTI,

beatæ et gloriosæ MARIÆ *semper* VIRGINIS, *beati* KENTIGERNI *et omnium sanctorum, et electorum* DEI,"—for a provost, eight prebends, and two boys, appointing, as was usual then, divine service to be daily offered "*pro anima bonæ memoriæ* JACOBI REGIS SCOTORUM, *et pro salute supremi Domini nostri* REGIS JACOBI *moderni, et Dominæ* MARIÆ *Reginæ, conjugis suæ; et pro salute animarum antecessorum, et successorum suorum; pro salute etiam animarum Domini* JOHANNIS CRICHTON *patris mei, et* CHRSTIANÆ *matris meæ, nec non pro salute animæ meæ, et* AGNETIS *conjugis meæ, et animarum omnium antecessorum, et successorum nostrorum; et pro salute omnium fidelium defunctorum,*" &c.

The ancient Church of Crichton still subsists, a small but venerable building, in the usual form of a cross, with a low and truncated belfry. The west end has been left unfinished.

There are also, without the gates of the castle, and at a gun-shot's distance, the ruins of a chapel, intended for divine service. It is remarkable, that, in Scotland, the chapel of the castle is often thus situated, perhaps to avoid admitting within the precincts of the fortification those whom it was not thought proper or decent to debar from the place of worship.

BORTHWICK CASTLE.

[TURNER.]

This ancient and stately tower rises out of the centre of a small, but well-cultivated valley, watered by a stream called the Gore, which, flowing to the north-eastward, joins the Esk near Kirkhill; thus deceiving the eye of the spectator, who is led to imagine it the same brook with that on which Crichton Castle is situated at about two miles distance, and which has a south-easterly course.

Contrary to the common case, Borthwick Castle did not give a territorial denomination to the Barons who possessed it; but, on the contrary, received its name from theirs. We should conceive that the baronial name of Borthwick was derived from the ancient parish of Borthwick, and the river of the same name in Selkirkshire; yet, genealogists find individuals so called settled in Berwickshire and elsewhere, before Sir William Borthwick, the most distinguished of the family, obtained from Robert, Duke of Albany, governor of Scotland, a charter of the barony of Borthwick, in Selkirkshire, formerly belonging to Robert Scott. In this uncertainty, tradition has taken the liberty of deducing the family from a supposed Andreas, Lord of Burtick, in Livonia, who was said to have

accompanied Queen Margaret from Hungary to Scotland in the year 1057.

It is certain that, however descended, Sir William de Borthwick, who was already possessor of Herriot-moor, bought from Sir William Hay the greater part of the manor of Locherworth, and bestowed upon it his own family name: he then obtained from King James I. a special license for erecting upon the spot called the *Mote* of Locherwart, a castle, or fortalice, and to surround the same with walls and ditches, to defend it with gates of brass or iron, and to place upon the summit defensive ornaments, by which is meant battlements and turrets: he was farther empowered to place in the castle so erected, a constable, a porter, and all other persons and things necessary for the defence thereof.[1] June 2, 1430.

Such licenses were not very common in Scot-

[1] [Litera licentiæ Willielmo de Borthwick de eodem militi ad construendum castrum.—(*Regist. Mag. Lib.* 3, *No.* 86.)—Jacobis Dei gratia Rex Scotorum. Omnibus probis hominibus suis ad quos presentes literæ pervenerint Salutem. Sciatis quod concessimus Dilecto et Fideli nostro Willielmo de Borthwick de eodem militi tanquam utile et honestum licentiam nostram specialem construendi castrum in loco illo qui vulgariter dicitur le Mote de Lochorwart infra vicecomitatum de Edinburgh ac ipsum castrum seu fortalicium erigere et fortificare muris fossisque circumcingere portis ereiis seu ferreis ac in sumitate ornamentis defensivis preparare. Et in eodem castro seu fortalicio constabularium janitorem custodesque necessarios et optimos pro sua voluntate ponendi et removendi ac omnia alia quæ ad securitatem et fortificationem dicti castri necessaria fuerint faciendi. In cujus rei testimonium has literas nostras sub magno sigillo nostro fieri fecimus patentes. Apud Edinburghum 2do die mensis Junii anno Domini 1430mo et regni nostri 25to.]

land, where each nobleman assumed the liberty of fortifying his castle according to his own means, and at his own pleasure; and where lesser proprietors were not only permitted, but even enjoined by law, to render the dwellings defensive against the common enemy. This document, therefore, seems to have arisen from the policy of James the First, who, being intent upon extending the power of the crown, and diminishing that of the great nobles, was probably desirous to render the royal license necessary in Scotland, as it was in England, to entitle a baron to fortify his own castle. There is a similar license granted for fortifying Duddingstone Castle, in East-Lothian, and other instances occur during the reigns of the three first Jameses.

Sir William de Borthwick, in virtue of this grant, erected a noble building, in the form of a double tower or donjon, seventy-four feet in length, sixty-eight feet in breadth, and in height ninety feet from the area to the battlements. The architecture is in the best style of the middle ages, and the mason-work is excellent; the walls are of hewn stone, both within and without, of the thickness of thirteen feet towards the foundation, gradually contracting to six feet at the top of the edifice. The castle occupies a knoll, or moat, surrounded by the small river, and is surrounded by an outer court, occupying the whole summit of the eminence, enclosed and fortified by a strong outward wall, having flanking towers at the angles. The entrance from the outer court to the donjon, or keep, seems to have been by means of a ramp, or perron of stone, raised to the height of the first story; and

thus communicating with the gate of the tower by a drawbridge. This is a common means of interior defence where there was no inner moat, and may be seen at Newark Castle in Selkirkshire, and other buildings of the fifteenth century. The reader will best conceive the nature of the perron, or ramp, by comparing it to a great horse-block, which resembles it in every thing excepting size; the top of this erection being on a level with the threshold of the gate, the exterior end of the drawbridge rested on it when lowered, and, when raised, left a vacancy of twelve or fourteen feet betwixt the gate and perron of ten or twelve feet in depth, and in length corresponding to the length of the drawbridge. Above the gateway is the figure of a bishop, whom we should pronounce to be Saint Andrew, could we see any vestige of his saltire or cross.

The interior of Borthwick Castle is exceedingly interesting. The joists, flooring, &c. have been destroyed and renewed, but the walls remain entire, and little encumbered with rubbish, and the floors of the great hall, chapel, &c. being laid on strong stone arches, have escaped demolition. Three stairs, ascending at the angles of the building, gave access to the separate stories. One is quite ruinous, but the others are still in indifferent good repair.

Mr Nisbet, the genealogist, fancifully imagines that this noble pile was built after the Hungarian form, in remembrance of the founder's origin; but, in truth, it differs no otherwise from the Scottish castles of the time than in its great beauty of proportion, and solidity of workmanship.

Like many other baronial residences in Scotland, Sir William de Borthwick built this magnificent pile upon the very verge of his own property. The usual reason for choosing such a situation was hinted by a northern baron, to whom a friend objected this circumstance as a defect, at least an inconvenience: "We'll *brizz yont*," (*Anglice*, press forward,) was the baron's answer; which expressed the policy of the powerful in settling their residence upon the extremity of their domains, as giving pretext and opportunity for making acquisitions at the expense of their neighbours. William de Hay, from whom Sir William Borthwick had acquired a part of Locherworth, is said to have looked with envy upon the splendid castle of his neighbour, and to have vented his spleen by building a mill upon the lands of Little Locherworth, immediately beneath the knoll on which the fortress was situated, declaring that the Lord of Borthwick, in all his pride, should never be out of hearing of the *clack* of his neighbour's mill. The mill accordingly still exists, as a property independent of the castle.

From the battlements of Borthwick Castle, which command a varied and beautiful view, the top of Crichton Castle can be discovered, lying about two miles distant to the eastward. The convenience of communicating by signal with a neighbouring fortress was an object so much studied in the erection of Scottish castles, that, in all probability, this formed one reason of the unusual height to which Borthwick Castle is raised.

William de Borthwick, by whom this magnificent tower was erected, made a considerable figure

in the reign of James I., and was one of those men of rank who sat as an assize upon the Duke of Lenox and Alexander, sons of the Duke of Albany, when these unfortunate princes were condemned and executed at Stirling in the year of God 1424. He appears to have been created Lord Borthwick previous to 1430; in which year his son received the honour of knighthood, together with the heir of his neighbour, Sir William Crichton, and others, and was then designed, *filius et Heres Gulielmi Domini de Borthwick.*

William, the second Lord Borthwick, according to genealogists, made also a figure in the history of his time; he adhered to the king in the feuds of the Douglasses, and sat in that Parliament by which doom of forfeiture was pronounced upon that powerful family on the 10th of June, 1455. Upon the 14th of March, 1457, we find Lord Borthwick protesting in open Parliament against the purpose of the king to raise Sir James Douglas of Dalkeith, for the reward of his loyalty, to the rank of Earl, by the title of Morton, alleging, that the lands of Morton belonged in property to his sister Janet, Lady Dalkeith, and Sir William Douglas, her son; wherefore, Lord Borthwick humbly implored the King, that no title might be conferred in prejudice of their right. It was replied by the Chancellor, that the place from which Lord Dalkeith was to derive the title of his proposed Earldom was Morton in Calderclear, and not the Castle and Barony of the same name in Clydesdale, belonging to his mother-in-law and to his half-

brother: upon which declaration Lord Borthwick took instruments.

In the records of Parliament, now rendered accessible to the public, by that most honourable national publication, superintended by Mr Thomson, the Depute Register, no name occurs more frequently as attending on the Scottish Estates than that of Lord Borthwick. The vicinity of the family residence to Edinburgh may, in some measure, account for this; but, unquestionably, their power and talents rendered them also able counsellors, and powerful assistants of the royal authority.

To relieve these dry antiquarian details, the reader may be amused with the following whimsical incident which took place in the Castle of Borthwick, in the year 1547. It appears, that, in consequence of a process betwixt Master George Hay de Minzeane and the Lord Borthwick, letters of excommunication had passed against the latter, on account of the contumacy of certain witnesses. William Langlands, an apparitor, or macer, (*baculariius,*) of the See of St Andrews, presented these letters to the Curate of the Church of Borthwick, requiring him to publish the same at the service of High Mass. It seems that the inhabitants of the Castle were at this time engaged in the favourite sport of enacting the Abbot of Unreason, a species of *High-jinks,* in which a mimic prelate was elected, who, like the Lord of Misrule in England, turned all sort of lawful authority, and particularly the Church Ritual, into ridicule. This frolicsome per-

son, with his retinue, notwithstanding of the apparitor's character, entered the church, seized upon the primate's officer without hesitation, and, dragging him to the mill-dam on the south side of the castle, compelled him to leap into the water. Not contented with this partial immersion, the Abbot of Unreason pronounced, that Mr William Langlands was not yet sufficiently bathed, and therefore caused his assistants to lay him on his back in the stream, and duck him in the most satisfactory and perfect manner. The unfortunate apparitor was then conducted back to the church, where, for his refreshment after his bath, the letters of excommunication were torn to pieces, and steeped in a bowl of wine; the mock abbot being probably of opinion, that a tough parchment was but dry eating. Langlands was compelled to eat the letters, and swallow the wine, and dismissed by the Abbot of Unreason, with the comfortable assurance, that, if any more such letters should arrive during the continuance of his office, "they should a' gang the same gait," *i. e.* go the same road. A similar scene occurs betwixt a Sumner of the Bishop of Rochester and Harpool, the servant of Lord Cobham, in the old play of Sir John Oldcastle, when the former compels the church-officer to eat his citation. The dialogue, which may be found in the note, contains most of the jests which may be supposed appropriate to such an extraordinary occasion.[1]

1 "*Harpool.* Marry, sir, is this process parchment?
Sumner. Yes, marry, is it.

The same incident occurs in another old play, The Pinner of Wakefield, where George a Greene tears the commission of a traitorous envoy, and

Harpool. And this seal wax?

Sumner. It is so.

Harpool. If this be parchment and this be wax, eat you this parchment and wax, or I will make parchment of your skin, and beat your brains into wax. Sirrah Sumner, despatch—devour, sirrah, devour.

Sumner. I am my Lord of Rochester's Sumner; I came to do my office, and thou shalt answer it.

Harpool. Sirrah, no railing, but betake thyself to thy teeth. Thou shalt eat no worse than thou bringest with thee. Thou bringest it for my lord, and wilt thou bring my lord worse than thou wilt eat thyself?

Sumner. Sir, I brought it not my lord to eat.

Harpool. O, do you *sir* me now! All's one for that; I'll make you eat it for bringing it.

Sumner. I cannot eat it.

Harpool. Can you not? S'blood, I'll beat you till you have a stomach. [*Beats him.*

Sumner. Oh, hold, hold, good Mr Servingman, I will eat it.

Harpool. Be champing, be chewing, sir, or I will chew you, you rogue. Tough wax is the purest of the honey.

Sumner. The purest of the honey!—O, lord, sir! oh! oh!

Harpool. Feed, feed, 'tis wholesome, rogue, wholesome. Cannot you, like an honest Sumner, walk with the devil your brother, to fetch in your bailiff's rents, but you must come to a nobleman's house with process? If thy seal were as broad as the lead which covers Rochester Church, thou shouldst eat it.

Sumner. Oh, I am almost choked—I am almost choked.

Harpool. Who's within there? will you shame my lord? Is there no beer in the house? Butler, I say.

Enter BUTLER.

Butler. Here, here.

Harpool. Give him beer. Tough old sheep-skin's but dry meat."

First part of Sir John Oldcastle. Act ii. Scene i.

compels the bearer "to eat the seals, or brook the stab."—See DODSLEY's *Old Plays*, vol. v., p. 11. A similar mode of expressing scorn, with some additional circumstances of disgrace, was actually adhibited to another ambassador by the citizens of Jedburgh.[1] Nash, in his controversy with Gabriel Harvey, gives yet another instance of this whimsical kind of revenge, as practised by the witty and dissolute Robert Greene. He says he saw him cause an apparitor to eat his citation, very handsomely served up betwixt two plates. The officers of the church seem to have been particularly obnoxious to this unpleasant treatment.

The Consistory Register of St Andrews, which contains this curious detail,[2] does not explain what

[1] See *Note*, from Bannatyne's *Journal*, *ante*, p. 71.

[2] The Extract was supplied to us by that eminent Scottish antiquary, J. Riddell, Esq. Advocate.

"Per officialem die lunæ xvi mensis Maii anno Domi, 1547°.

. . . . . .

"HAY, DOMINUS BORTHWICK,

"Eodem die (die lunæ) Willielmus Langlandis baculus literarum cititarum Domini Officialis emanatarum super Johannem Dominum Borthwik ad instantiam Magistri Georgii Hay de Mynzeane et literarum excommunicandum pro nonnullis testibus contumacibus, juravitque quod Idem Willielmus baculus presentavit literas hujusmodi Curato dicte ecclesie pro earundum executione facienda die dominico decimo quinto die mensis instantis Maii ante initium summe misse. Qui Curatus easdem ante summam missam deponenti redeliberavit, et dixit, se velle easdem exequi post summam missam. Et supervenit quidem vulgariter nuncupatus ye Abbot of Unressone of Borthwick, cum suis complicibus, and causit him passe wyt yam quhill he come to ye mylne-dam, at ye south syde of ye castell, and compellit him to lope in ye wattir, and quhan he had loppin in ye wattir, ye said Ab-

was done in consequence of so gross an insult to an officer of the church, farther than the curate was summoned to depone, in the name of the Abbot of Unreason, who, with his complices, was threatened with excommunication so soon as that should be ascertained. The incident serves, however, to show the progress of the Reformation at this period, as well as that unbounded license which, a few years afterwards, occasioned the choosing of Abbots of Unreason, and other popular sports of the same saturnalian description, to be prohibited by Act of Parliament. By the same statute, women singing round Summer-trees, or Maypoles, are ordered to be taken, handled, and put upon the ducking-stone ;—a rude penance for so classical and pastoral an amusement.

Act 155. ch. 40.

John, the fifth Lord Borthwick, though he probably patronised the license of the Abbot of Unreason, was, it is believed, a Catholic, certainly a loyalist and an adherent of Queen Mary. She

bot of Unressone, saide ye deponent was not weite aneuche nor deip aneuche, and wyt yat keist him doune in ye watter by ye shulderis. And yerefter ye deponent past agane to ye kirk, and deliverit yaim to ye curate for executione of ye samyn. And you, ye said Abbot of Unressone, came, and tuke ye letters furt of ye Curate's hand, and gaif ye deponent ane glasse full of wyne, and raif ye letters, and mulit ye samyn amangis ye wyne, and causit ye deponent drynk ye wyne ande eit ye letters, and saide, gif ony maa lettres came yair, salang as he war lord, yai sulde gang ye said gait: propterea judex decrevit Curatum citandum ad deponendum super nomine et cognomine dicti Abbatis de Unressone et suorum Complicium et literas in futurum exequendas in vicinioribus ecclesiis. Et dictus Abbas et complices excommunicandus quam primo constare poterit de eorundem nominibus."

frequently made use of his baronial castle in her progress through her kingdom: and it would appear that Lord Borthwick was a friend and ally of Bothwell, to whom, indeed, as Lord of Crichton Castle, he was a near neighbour. A journal of some material passages concerning Mary's motions, usually termed Cecil's, or Murray's Diary, contains the following entries:—

"October 7, 1566. My Lord Bothwell was hurt in Lyddisdale, *and the Queen* raid to Borthwick."

"June 7, 1567. He (Bothwell) purposed and raid against the Lord Houme and Fernherst, and so passed to Melros, and *she* to *Borthwick*."

"June 11, 1567. The lords came suddenly to Borthwick; Bothwell fled to Dunbar, and the lordis retyred to Edinbrough, she followed Bothwell to Dunbar disguised."

This might, in any ordinary historical investigation, seem a sufficient notice of what passed. But the history of Mary Stuart is invested with an interest, as well as a mystery, which attaches to no other part of Scottish history. Her beauty, her talents, her misfortunes, her errors, the watchword which her name has long afforded to contending partisans, have combined to irritate curiosity respecting the most trivial circumstance connected with her unhappy story. The following more minute detail of the anxious moment, in which she escaped from Borthwick, is taken from a letter of James Beaton, the Archbishop of Glasgow, written to his brother Andrew, for the information of that active prelate, dated 17th June, 1567.

A. D. 1567. On 11th June, Morton, Mar, Hume, and Lindsay, with other inferior barons, and attended by nine hundred or a thousand horse, on a sudden surrounded the Castle of Borthwick, where Bothwell was in company with the Queen. Bothwell had such early intelligence of their enterprise, that he had time to ride off with a very few attendants; and the insurgent nobles, when they became aware of his escape, retreated to Dalkeith, and from thence to Edinburgh, where they had friends who declared for them, in spite of the efforts of Queen Mary's partisans. The latter, finding themselves the weaker party, retreated to the castle, while the provost and the armed citizens, to whom the defence of the town was committed, did not, indeed, open their gates to the insurgent lords, but saw them forced without offering opposition. These sad tidings were carried to Mary by Beaton, the writer of the letter, who found her still at Borthwick, "so quiet, that there was none with her passing six or seven persons." She had probably calculated on the citizens of Edinburgh defending the capital against the insurgents; when this hope failed, she resolved on flight. "Her majesty," says the letter, "in men's clothes, booted and spurred, departed that same night from Borthwick to Dun bar: whereof no man knew, save my lord duke, [*i. e.* Bothwell, created Duke of Orkney,] and some of his servants, who met her majesty a mile from Borthwick, and conveyed her to Dunbar." We may gather from these particulars, that, although the confederated lords had declared against Bothwell, they had not as yet adopted the purpose

of imprisoning Queen Mary herself. When Bothwell's escape was made known, the blockade of Borthwick was instantly raised, although the place had neither garrison nor means of defence. The more audacious enterprise of making the Queen prisoner, had not been adopted by the insurgents until the event of the incidents at Carberry-hill showed such to have been the Scottish Queen's unpopularity at the time, that any attempt might be hazarded against her person or liberty, without the immediate risk of its being resented by her subjects. There seems to have been an interval of nearly two days betwixt the escape of Bothwell from Borthwick Castle, and the subsequent flight of the Queen in disguise to Dunbar. If, during that interval, Mary could have determined on separating her fortunes from those of the deservedly detested Bothwell, her page in history might have closed more happily.

John Knox gives the following account of the same incident and its consequences. The nobles, who proposed to set up James the Sixth, had assembled at Stirling, while the Queen and Bothwell were raising men in Lothian with a view of marching. "The lords failing of thair design at Borthwick Castle, went to Edinburgh, quherof they made thameselfis masters easely, having the affections of the people, notwithstanding the Erle of Huntly and Archbishop of Saint Androis perswasioun to the contrary: These two, with their associates, wer constrained to retire to the castle, quhere they wer received by Sir James Balfour, left there by Bothwell."

As the fifth Lord Borthwick was a faithful adherent of Queen Mary, his great-grandson, John, the eighth lord, was a follower of the king during the Great Civil War; he was not, however, a pure royalist, or, as their enemies termed them, a *malignant*, but adhered to the Scottish Parliament, and his name is to be found in the Committee of Estates, 1649; and on the 15th March, in the same important year. Upon this occasion Borthwick Castle, with all the other strong houses in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh, was garrisoned for the king, which greatly straitened the invading English army under Cromwell, and, joined to the cautious tactics of Lesley, compelled Oliver to a retreat from Edinburgh, which, but for the insolent presumption and pragmatical ignorance of the Presbyterian ministers, would have been both disgraceful and destructive. But when these false prophets had, by their meddling interference, occasioned the fatal battle of Dunbar, and the surrender of Edinburgh, the detached fortresses in Mid-Lothian fell one by one into the hands of the English.

Borthwick Castle seems to have held out gallantly, and the garrison employed themselves to the last in annoying the victorious army. This soon drew upon them the vengeance of Cromwell, who sent the following characteristic summons, dated at Edinburgh, 18th November, 1650, and endorsed—"For the Governor off Borthwick Castle —These."

"Sir,

'I thought fitt to send this trumpett to you to

let you know, that if you please to walk away with your company, and deliver the house to such as I shall send to receive it, you shall have libertie to carry off your arms and goods, and such other necessaries as you have. You harboured such parties in your house as have basely and inhumanely murdered our men; if you necessitate me to bend my cannon against you, you must expect what I doubt you will not be pleased with. I expect your present answer, and rest

"Your servant,
"O. CROMWELL."

Notwithstanding this very significant epistle, the governor of Borthwick Castle, supposed to be Lord Borthwick himself, held out the fortress, until artillery was opened upon it, and then surrendered it upon honourable terms. The effect of Cromwell's battery still remains, his fire having destroyed a part of the freestone facing of the eastern side of the castle. It is said, the family repeatedly afterwards attempted to repair the injury which the place had sustained, but without success; for, owing to the difficulty of uniting the modern and the ancient masonry, the former always fell down; a circumstance, if true, which argued little skill in the art of building, since nothing could be so easy as to cut into the old wall, so as to afford a sufficient foundation for the new work.

After the death of the last-mentioned Lord Borthwick, the title remained in abeyance; nor has it yet been resumed by any claimant who has

been able to make good his pretensions in the House of Lords.

The estates belonging to the family have been at one time immense. In the first conveyance of the Borthwick estates, executed August 1st, 1538, there are comprehended the Moat of Lochquarret, the castle of the same, called the Castle of Borthwick; half of Bateland, in the county of Edinburgh; Borthwick, in Selkirkshire; Legerwood, Glengelt, Colinlaw, and Brownhouse, in Berwickshire; Ormiston, Herriot, Herriotmuir, Hethpule, and Whitfield, in the county of Peebles; and Aberdour, in Aberdeenshire; which lands, by this deed, are destined to William, Lord of Borthwick; John Borthwick, his son, and apparent heir; Sir John Borthwick of Gordonhall; and William Borthwick of Crookstone, and their heirs-male respectively.

Regat. C. S. Lib. 26. No. 158.

Besides the descendants immediately connected by entail with the family succession, there were others of the name who were distinguished during the reigns of the several monarchs of the Stuart family. Such was Robert Borthwick, eminent for his skill both in founding and using artillery, at a time when both arts were little understood. He was Master of Artillery to James IV., and cast, among other pieces, the beautful train of guns called the Seven Sisters, so much admired by the victors whose prize they became on the fatal field of Flodden. He put on his guns this rude legend—

"Machina sum Scoto Borthwic fabricata Roberto."

Another person of the name was remarkable for using upon his death-bed the saying which is proverbially termed *David Borthwick's Testament.* He was bred an advocate, and acquired many large estates, which he put into his son Sir James Borthwick's possession during his own life. The young heir proved a prodigal, and spent all. Ballencrieff, the last estate which remained, was sold while the old lawyer was dying. He heard the evil news, and only replied, "What can I say?—I bequeath every man to the devil that begets a fool, and does not make a fool of him."

We return to the principal line of Borthwick. The last direct heir-male having, as already mentioned, deceased in the person of the ninth Lord Borthwick, in 1672, the castle and barony became the property of John Dundas of Harvistone, nephew of the deceased Lord Borthwick, and grandson of Sir James Dundas, of the distinguished family of Arnistoun. It passed afterwards by purchase to the family of Dalrymple of Cousland, and from thence to that of Mitchelson of Middleton.

By a late sale, the castle has been acquired by John Borthwick, Esq. of Crookstone, passing thus once more into a branch of the ancient family, from which the ruins derived their name, and who, as we believe, possesses a claim to inherit their ancient baronial honours. It is at any rate pleasant to consider, that so fine a specimen of ancient architecture, interesting also through so many remembrances, and, if deserted, still far from being ruinous, is now in possession of a fa-

mily so deeply interested in its preservation. To render such a castle habitable, however entire the walls, and pleasant the site, is usually impossible, without altogether destroying its character as a memorial of antiquity. But that the work of actual destruction, and even the slow progress of decay, should be arrested by timely and reverential attention, is what the historical antiquary will doubtless expect from a family possessing so proud a memorial of the grandeur of their ancestors. And it is with pleasure that we conclude this imperfect article, on one of the most beautiful and entire specimens of castle-architecture in Scotland, with expressing our conviction that it is now in the hands of a proprietor equally interested in its preservation, and disposed to attend to it.

THE GREAT HALL OF BORTHWICK CASTLE

[E. BLORE]

"Is," says Nisbet, "so large and high in the roof, that a man on horseback might turn a spear in it with all the ease imaginable." The ceiling of this stately apartment consists of a smooth vault of ashlerwork, the joining of the stones being curiously fitted together. The roof has been painted with such devices as occur in old illuminations. There can be still traced the representation of a castle,

with its battlements, towers, and pinnacles. and the legend, in Gothic characters, **Ye Temple of Honor,** is distinctly legible.

Stately and magnificent in itself, the Hall of Borthwick, as appears from our sketch of the history of the castle, is no less rich in associations. Here we may suppose the Abbot of Unreason was permitted to exercise his frolics, till the applause with which they were received encouraged him to set his mimic authority in competition with that of the Primate of Scotland. Here

"The stern protector of the conquered land"

received the keys of the castle, into which his cannon had forced an entrance. But, above all, the image of Queen Mary feasting with her unworthy Bothwell, startled from revelry by the voice of insurrection, and finally obliged to escape in the disguise of a page, comes before us with that deep interest which is excited by every vicissitude of her melancholy history.

It is pleasing to reflect, that so fine a remnant of antiquity as Borthwick Castle, is now the property of those most interested in saving it from falling to ruins. It is very capable of being rendered habitable; but Mr Borthwick of Crookstone, the proprietor, has, with better taste, determined to preserve the castle in its present state. The attempt to ingraft modern accommodations upon the simplicity of an ancient castle, is certain to destroy the points which render it interesting to an antiquary, without always answering the purpose intended by the inhabitant. So that, in the general

case, it is more judicious to arrest the progress of decay, and preserve ancient buildings in the style and form in which they were originally built, than to change their appearance, and injure their historical interest, by attempting to metamorphose them into modern places of residence.

TOWN OF DALKEITH.

[REV. J. THOMSON.]

THIS thriving town is a burgh of barony, lying about six miles from Edinburgh, and is most beautifully situated betwixt the rivers called the North and South Esk, which here approach close to each other, previous to their actual junction in the Park belonging to Dalkeith-House, about a mile and a half below the town.

In ancient times, the town of Dalkeith, as was almost universally the fashion in Scotland, run close up to, and was terminated by, the baronial castle, which served as a citadel to the town, and in time of need was garrisoned by the inhabitants. But the principal street, which is wide and handsome, is now terminated by the gate at the head of the avenue to the mansion, so that there is some interval between the town and the house, or, as it is popularly termed, the palace.

The etymology of the name cannot be easily

ascertained. Besides the barony of Keith, in Lothian, Inch-Keith, and other compounds of the same word, occur. It has passed into the proper name of a distinguished tribe, whose head was the Earl Mareschal of Scotland. But though the family of Keith probably took their name from the barony so called, of which they long held the property, that circumstance will not help us to the original sense of the word. Some have supposed Keith equivalent to the British word *Cath*, signifying *battle*, in which case Dalkeith would mean the field of battle, Inch-Keith the island of battle, and so forth. The learned Mr Chalmers inclines to derive the word *Keith* from *Caeth*, signifying, in Celtic, narrowness, or confined extent, which suits well with the situation of the town, betwixt two rivers.

Lying so near the metropolis, the barony, castle, and town of Dalkeith, were at a very early period possessed by proprietors of note and importance. The first upon record are the family yet remembered in the town of Dalkeith, by the popular name of the gallant Grahames. William de Grahame obtained from David I., so munificent in his grants to men of rank and valour, the lands of Abercorn and Dalkeith, in Lothian, in which he was succeeded by his eldest son, Patrick, while his second son, John, the ancestor of the Dukes of Montrose, obtained other possessions in Forfarshire and elsewhere. The male line of Patrick, the eldest son of William, became extinct in the reign of David II., ending in the person of Sir John de Grahame,

whose possessions of Lugton and Dalkeith, as well as extensive lands in Liddesdale, passed to his daughter Margaret, who married a Sir William Douglas, and thus transferred to that yet more powerful family the estates of her father.

No memorials remain of the Grahames about Dalkeith, unless the fading traditions of the place, and two curious, but wasted tombstones, which lie within the ruined circuit of the old church. They represent knights in chain-armour, lying cross-legged upon their monuments, like those ancient and curious figures on the tombs in the Temple Church, London.

Who the Sir William Douglas was, that, by his marriage with Margaret Grahame, acquired so fair an estate, antiquaries are by no means agreed. Thus far it seems to be certain, that he was the ancestor of the Earls of Morton. But a great confusion arises from the frequency of the name of William, in the House of Douglas, and from its being actually borne at this period by the celebrated Sir William Douglas of Polbothy, in Moffatdale, better known in history as the Knight of Liddesdale, and by several others. Mr Chalmers is decidedly of opinion, that although William of Dalkeith is sometimes termed the Lord of Liddesdale, and certainly had possessions there, he must be held a different person from the celebrated Knight of Liddesdale. His reasoning on this subject indicates his usual extent of research. Considerable difficulties, however, still hang around this obscure subject; one or two of which we may

be forgiven for stating, not as impugning Mr Chalmers's opinions, but as requiring further illustration.

It is, in the first place, an admitted fact, that Sir William Douglas of Dalkeith had a nephew, termed James Douglas, by whom he was succeeded. This is proved, among other circumstances, by two charters, the one signed at Dalkeith, 14th December, 1351, by which William of Douglas, designing himself Lord of the Valley of Liddell, confers the lands of Aberdower on his beloved nephew, James of Douglas, which charter he subscribes in presence of these witnesses, *Andrea de Douglas avunculo meo, Willielmo de Douglas seniore fratre meo.* Again, in a grant of certain lands to the church of Dalkeith, 1st June, 1406, Sir James Douglas, the grantor, mentions Sir John of Douglas, his father, the Lady Agnes, his mother, and " *Willielmi de Douglas domini Vallis de Leddalle avunculi nostri.*"

The relation of nephew and uncle, being therefore proved to exist betwixt Sir William Douglas of Dalkeith, designed the Lord of the Valley of Liddesdale, and Sir James Douglas, we shall proceed to show, that at least one ancient historian states the same connexion to have existed betwixt Sir James and the historical Knight of Liddesdale in contradiction of the system which would make the latter a distinct person from Sir William Douglas of Dalkeith, assuming also the title of Lord or Laird of Liddesdale.

Fordun, who is usually accurate, mentions the murder of David de Berkeley, in 1350, as com-

mitted at the instigation of William Douglas, then prisoner in England, in revenge of the death of his brother, John Douglas, father to James Douglas of Dalkeith, the elder.[1] That the historical Knight of Liddesdale is the person charged with the instigation of this crime, is certain, from his being described as "prisoner in England," where he remained from the date of the battle of Durham, where he was made captive, until 1351, when he was set at liberty upon a traitorous composition with the English monarch. It would seem to follow, that the historical Knight of Liddesdale, unless Fordun be mistaken, was that uncle to whom Sir James Douglas succeeded in the Lordship of Dalkeith. Indeed many other points of resemblance occur between these Sosias of Liddesdale, the two Sir William Douglasses.

Both married heiresses, and were designed of Liddesdale.

Both left an only daughter.

The Knight of Liddesdale was alive in 1351.

So was the Lord of Dalkeith.

The Knight of Liddesdale was slain in 1353, and it would be difficult to show that the Lord of Dalkeith survived that period.

Both of these Sir Williams had a father called Sir James.

Sir William Douglas of Dalkeith had, as appears from the charter above quoted, a brother, bearing his own name of William. And the Rotuli Scotiæ contain a safe conduct to a William

[1] Forduni *Scot. Chronicon*, vol. ii., p. 348.

Douglas, senior, who had been prisoner in the tower along with the Knight of Liddesdale. Which circumstances, by the way, add a third William Douglas to the list.

Yet, notwithstanding these remarkable indications of identity, as well as the direct testimony of Fordun, the following circumstances, collected by Mr Chalmers, go far to establish, that the Knight of Liddesdale, and the Lord of Dalkeith, were, in fact, distinct persons.

The wife of Sir William, by whom he succeeded to the estate of Dalkeith and Abercorn, is said to have been called Margaret. But the widow of the Knight of Liddesdale was certainly named Elizabeth, as appears from her curious treaty with the King of England after the death of her husband.[1]

Both were prisoners in England about the same time, but they were not taken on one occasion. William Douglas of Polbothy (indisputably the Knight of Liddesdale) was taken prisoner in a skirmish at Lochmaben, in March 1332-3, whereas William Douglas of Loudon or Dalkeith was made captive in the battle of Halidon, fought 19th July, 1333.

It seems hard to reconcile these distinct points of difference with the testimony of Fordun, whom we are therefore tempted to believe mistaken in terming the Knight of Liddesdale, who was the certain instigator of the murder of Berkely, the uncle of Sir James of Dalkeith. Godscroft had

[1] Rymer, vol. v., p. 760.

already noticed the existence of such an error, positively affirming, that the Knight of Liddesdale was "the son natural to (the good) Sir James, but not the brother of John of Dalkeith, (father to Sir James,) as some say." The point is not altogether indifferent to those claiming descent from the House of Dalkeith, since, if the Knight of Liddesdale could be identified with the founder, it would bastardize that whole race of the Douglasses.

To return from this digression, William Douglas of Dalkeith was succeeded by his nephew, Sir James, who transmitted the estate to a son of his own name, afterwards created Lord Dalkeith. The family finally attained the title of Earls of Morton.

But although the Douglasses of the Morton branch seem thus to have possessed the property of Dalkeith, yet, if Froissart's testimony can be received, the castle was occupied by the Earl of Douglas, the head of the house so named, and used by him as his own mansion. In describing the skirmish which passed at the barriers of Newcastle, the historian informs,

"There fought hand to hand the Earl of Douglas and Sir Henry Percy, and by force of arms the Earl Douglas wan the banner of Sir Henry Percy, wherewith he was sore displeased, and so were all the Englishmen; and the Earl Douglas said to Sir Henry Percy, 'Sir, I shall bear this token of your prowess into Scotland, and shall set it high on my Castle of Dalkeith (D'Alquest), that it may be seen afar off.'"—Berner's *Froissart*, vol. ii., p. 393. Reprint, 4to, 1812.

Hotspur's desire to regain his pennon led to the bloody battle of Otterbourne. With yet more

positive evidence, Froissart speaks in two passages of his having actually in person visited William Earl of Douglas at his Castle of Dalkeith.

"I, author of this book, in my youth, had ridden nigh over all the realm of Scotland, and I was then a fifteen days in the house of Earl William Douglas, father to the same Earl James, of whom I spoke of now. In a castle five leagues from Edinburgh, in the country called Dalkeith (D'Alquest), the same time, I saw there this Earl James, a fair young child, and a sister of his called the Lady Blanche."[1]

In another place, he again affirms,

"I, Sir John Froissart, author of this book, was in Scotland in the Earle's Castle of Dalkeith (D'Alquest,) living Earl William, at which time he had two children, a son and a daughter."[2]

Lord Hailes expresses an opinion, that Froissart may have mistaken James Lord of Dalkeith, for the Earl of Douglas. But this seems very unlikely; and we may rather suppose, that the strength of the Castle of Dalkeith, as well as its convenient neighbourhood to Edinburgh, caused it sometimes to be occupied by the Earls of Douglas, although the property remained with their kinsmen, the Douglasses of Dalkeith and Morton.

In the busy reign of Queen Mary, the Castle of Dalkeith was the stronghold of the celebrated Earl of Morton, afterwards regent. It was surrendered to the English, as is mentioned by Sadler, shortly after the fatal battle of Pinkie. It was the headquarters of Morton during that calamitous period, called from him the *Douglas wars*, when he on the one hand, and Kirkaldy of Grange,

[1] Berner's *Froissart*, vol. ii., p. 396.
[2] *Ibidem*, p 404.

then governor of Edinburgh Castle, on the other, were engaged in constant skirmishes, in which no quarter was given, or when, if prisoners chanced to be made, they were executed in cold blood. After Morton had resigned the regency, he retired to his Castle of Dalkeith, which, from the general idea entertained of his character, acquired at that time the expressive name of the Lion's Den. When Morton was executed, the barony of Dalkeith was included in his attainder, and although the whole was finally restored to the Earl of Morton, yet the castle seems long to have been considered as public property, and used as such.

Thus, in Monipenny's Chronicle, the author classes among the palaces appertaining to the king, "the palace of Dalkeith, reserved for the use of the prince, with the orchard, garden, banks and woods adjoining thereunto, within four miles of Edinburgh." In the eventful year 1639, the Duke of Hamilton, then royal commissioner, occupied Dalkeith House during his unavailing disputes with the Covenanters. And it appears from a passage in Baillie's Letters, that he had conveyed thither the regalia of Scotland, either in order to secure them from the insurgent nobles, or perhaps with a view to their removal into England.

In the year 1642, the estate was purchased from the Earl of Morton by Francis Earl of Buccleuch. But Dalkeith House continued during the usurpation to be used as public property, and became the residence of General Monk, to whom Cromwell delegated the government of Scotland. He made several improvements around the place, and amused

himself particularly with gardening and the cultivation of flowers, in which he took great pleasure.

After the Restoration, and as we believe after the fate of her unhappy husband, Ann Duchess of Buccleuch and Monmouth repaired the ancient castle, in a manner which adapted it well for the residence of so great a family. A new front and wings, containing a noble entrance-hall, staircase, and gallery, amongst other apartments, was erected, facing the south, and the moat being filled up, gave free access to carriages. The more ancient part of the building lost its castellated appearance, to assume that of a large and modern mansion; but the situation on the steep banks of the Esk, and the extreme thickness of the walls attest what has been its former strength. There is a popular belief current, that the treasure, unrighteously amassed by the Regent Morton, lies hidden somewhere among the vaults of the ancient building. But Godscroft assures us that it was expended by the Earl of Angus in supporting the companions of his exile in England, and that when it was exhausted, the Earl generously exclaimed, "Is it then all gone? Let it go—I never looked it should have done so much good."

The North and South Esk join their streams in the park of Dalkeith, which is eminently beautiful, and the house, with the surrounding scenery, form a suitable residence for the distinguished family who have now inhabited it for more than a century.[1]

[1] [Dalkeith House was honoured in becoming the residence of King George the Fourth, during his visit to Scotland in August, 1822.]

The church of Dalkeith, which is a distinguished object in the plate, was merely the chapel of the castle, until Sir James Douglas, so late as 1406, rendered it collegiate. In Bagimont's Roll, (tempore Jacobi v^ti,) the provostry of Dalkeith is only rated at £3 : 6 : 8. Since the Reformation, Dalkeith has not only been accounted a parish church, but has given name to a presbytery, comprehending fifteen other parishes. The church is a Gothic building of very ordinary workmanship, of which the eastern end is unroofed and ruinous, the walls serving, however, to enclose a burial ground, containing the remarkable monuments of the Grahames, which have been already noticed, from which opens the funeral vault of the family of Buccleuch.

GENERAL ACCOUNT OF EDINBURGH.

The History of Edinburgh, properly so called, would be the abridged History of Scotland, and, too brief to be really instructive, would be far too tedious and jejune to be amusing.

The city, or rather its castle, was anciently known by the Celtic name of *Maydin*, which the Romans translated *Castrum Puellarum*. Among many etymologies of the more modern name, the most plausible is that which derives Edinburgh, (in Gaelic Dun-Edin,) from the Saxon King Edwin, who repaired the fortress, and gave a new name to

it. The place may have been acquired by the Saxons, after the battle of Cattraeth, (celebrated in the British language by Aneurin, and in English by Gray,[1]) the consequences of which included the Middle and Eastern Lothian, in the kingdom of Northumberland, which was fought about the middle of the sixth century. But Edwin lived in the earlier part of the seventh century.

In the meantime the Scots, properly so called, who, from an inconsiderable Irish colony, had, by their subjugation of the Picts, become a strong and formidable people, gradually extended their way to the shores of Fife; and during the convulsions of the Heptarchy, Malcolm II., about 1020, obtained a cession of Lothian from the Saxon Earl Eadulf, and it has ever since remained a part of the kingdom of Scotland. The Scottish kings did, indeed, continue for several reigns to "sit in Dumfermline town," or to reside at Scone; but gradually the strength and security of Edinburgh encouraged them to fix their metropolis upon the southern side of the Forth, and Edinburgh at length acquired the character and name of a capital. We can yet

[1] ["To Cattraeth's vale in glittering row
Twice two hundred warriors go;
Every warrior's manly neck
Chains of regal honour deck,
Wreath'd in many a golden link:
From the golden cup they drink
Nectar, that the bees produce,
Or the grapes ecstatic juice.
Flush'd with mirth and hope they burn;
But none from Cattraeth's vale return,
Save Aëron brave, and Conan strong,
(Bursting through the bloody throng,)
And I, the meanest of them all,
That live to weep, and sing their fall."
GRAY'S *Ode on the death* of *Hoel*, from the *Gododin of Aneurin*.]

trace, in some of the names of places around the royal palace, remains of the Celtic language of the early Scottish kings, as *Croft-an-Ri*, (corrupted into Croft-angry,) the King's Croft; *Gael-ton* (now Calton) the dwelling of the Gael, and so forth.

From this period, for many a stormy year, Edinburgh maintained her character as metropolis of Scotland, and during several centuries was neither much enlarged nor contracted. The ridge of the hill, crowned with the castle at one end, and secured by the Netherbow Port at the other, was gradually covered with houses, which, from the steepness of the site, rose to an uncommon height. The city was defended on the north side by a lake, now drained, and on the south by the natural steepness of the ground, and finally, by a wall. To the east, the city was combined with the suburb, called the Canongate, which, in process of time, formed the court-end of the metropolis, and was filled with the town residences and hotels of the nobility, extending from the Netherbow-Gate to the palace of Holy-Rood. Such was Edinburgh at the union of the crowns, nor was it materially changed until after the consequences of the Rebellion of 1745, when the abolition of hereditary jurisdictions, and the unity and impulse given to the country by the annihilation of domestic faction, began to open new views of industry, and comparative opulence became attended with fresh wants, and with the usual demand for increasing accommodations.

Hitherto the domestic establishments of Edinburgh much more nearly resembled those of Paris, than that complete system of comfort long since

adopted in London. In the lofty castles of the Old Town, family resided above family, each habitation occupying one story of the tall mansion, or land. The whole was accessible by one stair, which, common to all the inhabitants, was rarely cleaned and imperfectly lighted; the windows were the only means of ridding nuisances, and the tardy cry of *Gardez l'eau*, was sometimes, like the shriek of the Water Kelpy, rather the elegy, than the warning, of the overwhelmed passenger. Want of cleanliness was frequently accompanied by its natural attendant, want of health. Indeed, where men, and women, and children were crowded together within such narrow bounds as one story of an Edinburgh house afforded to a family of the middling rank, sickness was necessarily frequent, and there is reason to think that mortality, especially among children secluded from exercise, was in proportion considerable. In one gentleman's family, which then resided in a lodging opposite to the Cross, six children were born, who successively died of the diseases of childhood. The same family afterwards removed to George's Square, a free and healthy situation, and five children, born after that change of residence, grew up to be healthy men and women.

The same narrowness of accommodation had its effect on the morals of the men. All business, especially whatever concerned the law, was necessarily transacted in taverns, and in taverns also were held all festive meetings; the necessary consequence of which was deep and constant drinking. Each inhabitable space was crowded like the under-

deck of a ship. Sickness had no nook of quiet, affliction no retreat for solitary indulgence. In addition to these inconveniences, it is scarce worth mentioning, that every drop of water used in a family had to be carried up these interminable stairs on a porter's shoulders; that the hearing was constantly assailed by the noise of neighbours above and below; that many of the rooms were dark even at noon-day, or borrowed but a gleam from some dark alley; and that in ordinary houses there was scarcely space enough for the most necessary articles of household furniture.

Still, with all its inconveniences, this style of living was long looked back to with fond regret by many who survived that great change, which might be said to commence about sixty years ago. The close neighbourhood into which they were previously formed gave the Scotch, a proud and poor people, the means of maintaining frequent and genteel society, without incurring much expense. All visits were made in sedan-chairs, and even a large circle of acquaintance could be maintained at a trifling expense. The ladies entertained only at tea; for dinner parties, except on extraordinary occasions, were confined to near relations. Much is said, and no doubt with truth, of the display of fashion and elegance, which assembled on those occasions; and wealth having comparatively little means to display itself, birth and breeding claimed and obtained more general respect than is paid to them in the modern more public and promiscuous assemblies. In society of a class somewhat lower, the closeness of residence had also its advantages.

Neighbours were so dependent on each other for mutual comfort and assistance, that they were compelled to live on terms of kindliness and harmony, which soon became habit, and gave a tone of social enjoyment to the whole system, which perhaps conduced as much to general happiness as do the feelings of sturdy independence and indifference, with which the owner of a "house within itself" usually regards his next neighbours. In an Edinburgh *land*, a sort of general interest united the whole inhabitants, from the top to the bottom of these lofty tenements. Love and friendship might communicate through cielings no thicker than the wall of Pyramus; and as the possessors were usually of very different ranks, charity had not far to travel from home ere she found fitting objects of her regard.

Such are the advantages which the poor and aristocratic gentry of Scotland used to ascribe to the old system of Edinburgh manners, when they found that new wants, and a different set of habits, rendered it difficult for them to maintain their ground in that by which it was superseded. But the progress of society cannot be suspended, and while it moves on, must display new advantages and inconveniences as the wheel gradually revolves.[1]

When the population of Edinburgh appeared first disposed to burst from the walls within which it had been so long confined, it seemed natural to suppose that the tide would have extended to the south side of Edinburgh, and that the New Town would have

[1] [See in Mr Creech's *Edinburgh Fugitive Pieces*, a curious "Comparative View of Edinburgh, in the years 1763, 1783, and 1793, respecting the modes of living, trade, manners," &c.]

occupied the extensive plain on the south side of the college. The descent from the Old Town to the south, though considerable, is not equal to that on the north side, and the North Loch itself seemed to interpose an insurmountable obstacle betwixt what was then the principal city, and any buildings which might be erected on its northen bank. Accordingly, the city did at first seem to expand itself towards the south. Argyle Square and Brown's Square, built on the model of London houses of the middling class, found respectable and fashionable inhabitants;[1] and George's Square, the greater part of which was built upon a more extended plan of size and accommodation, was yet more popular. These districts formed, about twenty or thirty years since, a little world of their own, and had their own assembly-rooms, and society of an excellent quality, in some degree apart from the rest of Edinburgh. They boasted, among other advantages, the residence of most of the members of the Mirror-Club, and many other characters of eminence in the law, and of fashion in society. Nay, singular as it may appear, there was one instance, if not more, of a respectable gentleman living and dying in the south side of Edinburgh, without ever having visited, or even seen, the New Town, although, at the time of his death, the original plan of that large addition to Edinburgh was nearly executed.

But, in order that the town should have extended itself in a southward direction, it would have been

[1] [Brown Square is now (September 1834) undergoing the process of demolition, to make way for a new south-western approach to Edinburgh.]

necessary that a general plan had been laid down and acted upon from the beginning, so as to ensure the squares and streets, containing houses of the opulent, from being surrounded, and as it were insulated, by the mean and obscure accommodations proper to a suburb; and, in the present case, the ground belonged to many proprietors, so that an agreement for such a purpose was altogether impossible. In the meanwhile, Provost Drummond's shrewd and intelligent mind had devised the means of securing those advantages on the opposite side of the city. The draining of the North Loch, and occupation of the hollow by what is called the North Bridge, formed a communication with a large and level space of ground, which belonged to Heriot's Hospital, and of which the magistrates of Edinburgh acquired the property, with the purpose of founding that New Town which has since been built there. The well-known plan is that of a principal street, terminated by a square at either end, with two rows running parallel to it, connected with handsome cross streets at regular intervals, so that in the map it resembles a succession of parallelograms. The scheme was an obvious and commonplace idea, to which the nobleness of the prospect, looking from Prince's Street at the magnificent though confused mass of the Old City, terminated by the Castle, and from Queen's Street upon the Frith of Forth and the mountains beyond, could alone have given dignity.

The tameness, which exists in the original conception of the plan, might have been much relieved by the architecture. But, to say truth, men's

minds were not at that time ripe for the splendid ideas which have been since entertained. The New Town, at its commencement, had to struggle with the rivalry of George's Square, and with the prejudices of persons attached to the Old City, who predicted loudly that the plan would altogether fail. The buildings, therefore, at the east end of Prince's Street were necessarily undertaken on a moderate scale of expense; and even those of St Andrew's Square, though good houses within, present no decorations on the exterior, excepting on the east side, where an example had been set by the magnificence of Sir Lawrence Dundas, who built for his own residence the handsome hotel now occupied as the Excise Office.[1] Unquestionably, any plan which could at that time have been proposed, for breaking the uniformity, or adorning the monotonous simplicity, of the New Town, whether by introduction of more public buildings, or by ornamenting the exterior of private houses, and concealing with blocking-courses the long mean line of sloping roofs, would have been a serious obstruction to the general success of the undertaking. Yet every eye is now sensible, that George's Street, otherwise so handsome, is rendered mean by its extreme breadth, which extends betwixt two lines of low houses, whose broad slated roofs are unbroken and undignified by projections or occasional elevations.

Our criticism indeed applies even to circum-

[1] [The business of the Excise Office has been removed to London, and the building referred to is now occupied as the Royal Bank of Scotland, 1834.]

stances connected with the original plan of the New Town, for which the poverty or narrow spirit of the times in which it originated forms no sufficient answer. It unfortunately occurred to some of the parties concerned, that the earth, dug out of the foundation of the new houses, might be employed to advantage in forming a communication with the Old Town, by the creation of that Mound of earth which is now extended across the valley. For this purpose, the proprietors and builders of houses were bound, in their contracts with the City, to excavate their front areas to a certain depth, in order that each might contribute a share of earth to a great, and, as it was then thought, most useful undertaking. This was the origin of that huge deformity which now extends its lumpish length betwixt Bank Street and Hanover Street, the most hopeless and irremediable error which has been committed in the course of the improvements of Edinburgh, and which, when the view which it has interrupted is contrasted with that which it presents, is, and must be, a subject of constant regret and provocation. Had the areas formed in the New Town been no more than half their present depth, the following consequences would have necessarily arisen:—1. The feuars, relieved of a very considerable expense, would have been able to pay a larger ground-rent. 2. The houses, being higher by the half story, which is now buried below ground, would have acquired more dignity and importance. 3. The surplus saved would have been more than sufficient to build a handsome arched bridge, where the

earthen hulk extends itself, furnishing all the convenience now derived from that mass of deformity, and substituting instead an object of high architectural beauty.

The New Town of Edinburgh, as originally planned, contrary to every prediction which had been uttered on the subject, was built and occupied within forty years after it had been commenced; and great as was the additional space and accommodation which it afforded, it may be considered as having been tenanted, in a great measure, by emigrants from the Old Town, or new colonists from the southern districts; and thus the city was much extended in space, without any material increase of inhabitants. It was soon found, however, that provision must be made for an actual progressive increase of population, and that of a kind which demanded no ordinary accommodation. The circumstances of the country drove many of the smaller gentry of Scotland to the capital for the education of their families, or for enjoyment of its pleasures; while the old family seats, where, in former times, brave young men, and handsome women, were bred with hardy yet undegrading simplicity, and the inhabitants of which maintained a cordial neighbourhood amongst themselves, have been gradually abandoned to the owls and rats in winter, and to English sportsmen during the summer. Many gentlemen from the north of England, and some from Ireland, added considerably to the demand for houses, induced by the advantages of Edinburgh as a place of residence and education, compared with the cheapness of living.

Besides all this, a gradual inclination for increasing accommodation began to take place even in the New Town itself. The first generation which had migrated thither, carried much of their Old Town habits along with them; and to reside upon a "Flat," or single story, was the choice of many respectable families. But when these passed away, the *Flats* were gradually abandoned to those who let lodgings, or to bachelors, dowagers, and single ladies; and the families, whose fathers had contentedly occupied them, descended from their "common stairs" to claim the dignity of a front-door.

These various demands gave rise to a third town, which rises below Queen Street; and happily separated from it by a row of long gardens, extends into a succession of streets and squares, in which an old inhabitant of Edinburgh finds himself completely a stranger, and where the houses, whether the external appearance or internal convenience is considered, may match with any in the world. Yet no sooner are the new houses finished, than they are eagerly purchased; and while each asks another from whence the inhabitants are to come for the long lines of palaces, which seem to rise from the ground like exhalations, the builder finds every speculation succeed, and as yet "the end is not." How far that end is distant, or how long this increase, both of expense and luxury, is to be progressive, we dare not even attempt to guess. It has withstood circumstances well calculated to check it—an expensive war—an increase of assessments of every kind—a high advance in the necessaries of life, both real, and rendered such

by custom—a depression of rents, and a general restriction of credit, and may perhaps continue to increase for a length of time to come, unless (which may God avert) the prosperity of the country be interrupted by civil discord. An Englishman, nay even a modern Scotchman, may start at being reminded, that this existing generation is the only one which has lived and died in Edinburgh, without witnessing a civil and intestine war, with all the disastrous circumstances by which it is preceded and followed—deadly hatred—destruction of credit—interruption of industry—military violence and rapine—bloodshed in the field and flight—ruin of families and proscriptions of individuals. Our fathers beheld the insurrection of 1745—our grandsires those of 1689 and 1715—the preceding race were witnesses to the great Civil War—and a generation yet older carries us back to those dark periods when the sword was never sheathed. It is, therefore, to these inestimable blessings, "Peace on earth, and good-will amongst men," that the rapid and yet increasing prosperity of Scotland and its metropolis has its origin—a circumstance well worth the consideration of those who enjoy it.

If we consider the effect which this unparalleled increase of the capital has had upon manners, we will find the aged regretting the more restricted, select, and yet easy society, in which they moved some thirty years since, when families met more frequently, with less form and expense, and upon very brief notice, to enjoy a social and domestic meal of plain cookery, with a glass of good port-wine or claret, which was sometimes allowed

to circulate too often, and too long. The tea-table, and the card-party, however, claimed their rights sooner or later; and perhaps the young ladies might thank the claret for the frequent proposal of rolling aside the carpet, and dancing to the pianoforte.—And certainly he who has witnessed and partaken of pleasures attainable upon such easy terms, may be allowed to murmur at modern parties, where, with much more form and more expense, the same cheerful results are not equally secured. When, after a month's invitation, he meets a large party of twenty or thirty people, probably little known to him and to each other, who are entertained with French cookery, and a variety of expensive wines offered in succession, while circumstances often betray that the landlord is making an effort beyond his usual habits; when the company protract a dull effort at conversation, under the reserve imposed by their being strangers to each other, and reunite with the ladies, sober enough it is true, but dull enough also, to drink cold coffee, he expects at least to finish the evening with the dance and song, or the lively talk around the fire, or the comfortable old-fashioned rubber. But these are no part of modern manners. No sooner is the dinner party ended, than each guest sets forth on a nocturnal cruize from one crowded party to another; and ends by elbowing, it may be, in King Street, about three o'clock in the morning, the very same folk whom he elbowed at ten o'clock at night in Charlotte Square, and who, like himself, have spent the whole night in the streets, and in going in or out of lighted apartments. Our

senior, too, will recollect with a sigh the Old Assembly Rooms, or Dun's Rooms, or the George's-Street Rooms, when first opened as a place of public amusement, where all persons, of rank and fashion entitling them to frequent such places, met upon easy and upon equal terms, and without any attempt at intrusion on the part of others; where the pretensions of every one were known and judged of by their birth and manners, and not by assumed airs of extravagance, or a lavish display of wealth; and he will conclude, upon the whole, that the society of the higher classes in Edinburgh was formerly more select, the members better known to each other, and, therefore, more easy in intercourse than at the present day.

Arguments are not, however, wanting to balance those which occur to the praiser of the past times. It signifies not very much how or in what manner society is carried on, providing the domestic virtues are not injured by the mode in which pleasure is pursued; and it may be safely said, that, in the present condition of Edinburgh, the men have gained much on the score of sobriety, while the women have, as yet, lost none of that high character for conjugal, filial, and maternal affection, for which they have been long distinguished. An "arrangement," so common in the London circles, is a word unknown; and since scandal is silent, we may safely conclude that little cause exists for calumny. The husband is, as yet, the companion of his wife upon all ordinary parties of pleasure, and the brother the usual attendant of the sisters. In short, the domestic relations are still maintained in the same

purity; and there are few cities where fashion has introduced so many changes, yet so few vices.

It is a minor consideration, which it yet falls in our way particularly to notice, that of the increased expenditure much is employed in the encouragement of the fine arts; that the purchase of books is a common expense with all classes, and that of pictures introduced amongst the opulent; while society is proportionally improved by the conversation to which so general a taste gives rise. The lawyer of former days was esteemed irrevocably lost to his profession, if he meddled with literature, or employed his spare time in any relaxation save that of cards or the bottle. But now the most successful professional men are both aspirants after, and dispensers of, literary fame; and there is spread through society at large a more general tinge of information and good conversation than is to be met with elsewhere. This circumstance may be perhaps traced to the general mixture of fashionable and literary persons in Edinburgh, where the society is not extensive enough to enable either to form a class by themselves, and where, of course, wit and learning become tempered and fashioned by their constant intercourse with polished manners, beauty, and high rank. It is also a happy circumstance, and speaks the good sense of the country, that, unless when the *mania* of Whig and Tory chances to be peculiarly virulent, there does not exist in Edinburgh any of those party-feelings, which, for one cause or other, are found to split and divide the society elsewhere. The inhabitants, generally speaking, live in much harmony with

each other; and though political opinions (as is usual when men are at a distance from the scene of action) are maintained with keenness, and even with acrimony, the harmony of the place is interrupted by no other causes of schism.

Upon the whole, those whose health can support a climate so variable and so trying as that of Edinburgh, will find few more eligible places of residence. The inhabitant of this ancient capital—"Scotland's dearest seat," as the city was termed by her best poet,[1] is surrounded by the noblest scenery, and ruins of antiquity; and may have, at every step, a companion capable of detailing the beauties of the one, and the history of the other. His mornings may be spent in study, for which there is every species of assistance within his reach; and his evenings with friendship or with beauty. If he has children, he has within his reach the first means of education. If he is gay, there are at his command all the usual varied sources of amusement. He may live, if he will, in a palace, with a handsome suite of apartments, for less than would rent a "dungeon in the Strand;" and fare sumptuously every day for half the rate which is exacted for a bad dinner in an English inn. To be more particular, L.3000 a-year is, in Edinburgh, opulence—L.2000, ease and wealth—L.1000, a handsome competence—and even L.500, well managed, will maintain a large family with all the necessaries and decencies of life, and enable them to support a very creditable rank in society.

[1] ["Edina, Scotia's *darling* seat,
All hail thy palaces and towers," &c.
BURNS.]

HIGH STREET OF EDINBURGH.

[TURNER.]

THIS noble street was long considered as one of the finest in Europe. In its original state, indeed, it might rather be called a place than a street. The suburb of the Canongate, where the street is considerably narrowed, was excluded from the view by a gateway, called the Netherbow Port, above which arose a steeple.[1] The more western, or upper boundary, was the large building called the Luckenbooths, which seemed almost entirely to close the High Street at that extremity.[2] On each side arose an uninterrupted line of very lofty houses. So that, regarded in every point of view, the High Street seemed to be enclosed, and divided from the rest of the town, as well as from the narrower streets which formed its communication with the castle on the westward, and the palace upon the east.

The first considerable change which was made, was by the pulling down of the Netherbow Port, which corresponded to the Temple-Bar of London. However much this alteration might improve the access from the eastward to the High Street, there can be no doubt that its

A. D. 1764.

[1] [See an Engraving in Maitland's *History of Edinburgh.*]

[2] [The Luckenbooths, *i. e.*, *close shops*, an unsightly row of buildings, extending along the whole northern side of St Giles's Cathedral, were pulled down in 1808, and their extremities, a remnant commonly called "Creech's land," on the east, and the Tolbooth on the west, in 1817.]

outward appearance was changed for the worse; since, instead of the architectural termination formed by the gateway and steeple, the eye is now presented with a view into the narrower and meaner street called the Canongate. Since that period, a large opening has been made in the High Street, forming the access from the North Bridge; and corresponding streets have been since opened from the South Bridge, and from Hunter's Square, thus insulating the Tron Church, which formerly made a continued part of the southern line of the street. The utility of these avenues from the north and south is indisputable; and perhaps many may be of opinion that they improve even the external appearance of the street, though this will hardly be granted by those who recollect the stately and almost sublime effect produced, when the lofty line of houses on each side was entire and unbroken. All at least will agree in censuring the destruction of the Cross of Edinburgh, a curious architectural object, whose site is now only marked by a cross inscribed on the causeway.[1] It also happened, that

[1] ["Dun-Edin's Cross, a pillar'd stone,
Rose on a turret octagon;
But now is razed that monument,
Whence royal edict rang,
And voice of Scotland's law was sent
In glorious trumpet-clang.
O! be his tomb as lead to lead,
Upon its dull destroyer's head!—
A minstrel's malison is said."
Marmion, canto v., st. 25,

and see note, *Ibid.*, p. 275—"As soon as the workmen began the act of demolition, which was in the morning of March 13, (1756,) some gentlemen who had spent the night over a social bottle, caused wine and glasses be carried thither, mounted the ancient fabric, and solemnly drank its dirge.

in order to bring the High Street to a level with the access from the South Bridge, it became necessary to deepen the street as it were, and to lay the new causeway several feet lower. This was an unlucky circumstance; for the old causeway, executed, it is said, by one Merlin a Frenchman, was beautifully arched, and upon the whole a very fine piece of workmanship.[1]

An innovation has since taken place of much greater consequence than any that has been yet noticed. This has been created by the demolition of the large building called the Luckenbooths, and of the ancient Tolbooth, which made a part of that mass of buildings.[2] The removal of these interruptions gives to view the Cathedral Church of St Giles upon the left hand, and in front extends the

Scots Magazine, 1756. The middle pillar of the cross is still preserved in the pleasure grounds of Drum, and some ornamental parts of the structure at Abbotsford."]

[1] Maitland mentions, that in 1532, the Common Council agreed with John Mayser and Bartilmew Foliot, French paviors, at the rate of thirty shillings Scotch per rood, the town furnishing carriage and sand. This, Maitland considers as irreconcilable with the common tradition, ascribing the paving of the street to one Merlin, who is said to have been interred at his own particular request in the High Street, near the top of Merlin's Wynd, to which he bequeathed his name. His grave is still marked by stones laid in the form of a coffin. It is possible that this Merlin may have been the immediate superintendent and executor of the work contracted for by Mayser and Foliot; for it is highly improbable, that the street of Edinburgh was paved before the year 1542.

[2] [The old Tolbooth of Edinburgh, at the north-west corner of St Giles's Church, "The Heart of Midlothian," was pulled down in 1817. The stonework of the gateway is preserved at Abbotsford.]

prospect up the Lawnmarket, and nearly as far as the Castlehill.

There is not the same objection to this prolongation of the view, which occurred upon taking down the Netherbow Port; for the Lawnmarket, which is now rendered a part of the High Street, has the same breadth and general character with the street to which it is added. On the other hand, those who exclaimed against the Luckenbooths, on account of their hiding from the public eye the architecture of the cathedral, were not aware that the architect of this last structure had never designed this part of the work to be visible; and that very extensive alterations, or rather a totally new face to the northern side of the church, will be an indispensable and necessary consequence of laying it open to the public eye. Still, it cannot be denied, that under all its mutilations, the High Street of Edinburgh is the most magnificent in Great Britain, excepting perhaps the High Street of Oxford. Unquestionably the principal street of Edinburgh is deficient in the rich magnificence occasioned by the succession of halls, colleges, churches, and public buildings displayed at the seat of the Southern Muses, and which seem to have jostled into retired nooks all that is mean and commonplace, or appropriated to the lower and ordinary business of life. But, on the other hand, this ancient boast of the Caledonian Metropolis has, from the extreme height of the houses, the forms of their projected battlements and gables, varied in detail, yet uniform in general effect, and the long sweep which it makes, interrupted by few transverse cuts or openings, a simple

and majestic unity of appearance, which it is not easy to find elsewhere.

EDINBURGH, FROM BRAID HILLS.

[CALLCOTT.]

THIS prospect, though not certainly the richest and most romantic in the vicinity of Edinburgh, is possessed of extreme beauty, and excels others in the magnificence with which the Frith of Forth, its islands, and its northern shores, lie displayed as the background of the Scottish metropolis.

The Hills of Braid, from which the view is taken, are rocky eminences, of considerable height, arising to the south of Edinburgh, and within about a mile and a half of the suburbs. They are divided by a small brook, called the Braid Burn; and the more northern side, on which the spectator is supposed to be stationed, is called Blackford Hill. It is the property of H. Trotter, Esq. of Mortonhall; Braid, properly so called, belonging to Charles Gordon, Esq. of Clunie.

In earlier times, the property belonged to a family called Fairly; and the Laird of Braid during the Reformation, was one of the earliest who received its doctrines, as well as a personal friend and zealous defender of John Knox. He is often mentioned in the life and correspondence of that

Apostle of Presbyterianism, and seems to have incurred personal danger more than once by his steadiness and zeal. Richard Bannatyne, Knox's faithful amanuensis, gives an account of an attack made upon this gentleman in his own house of Braid, which he seems to have repelled with much spirit and success.[1] The great reformer, when on

[1] Bannatyne's account of the affair, divested of his uncouth spelling is as follows:—"Friday, 25th May, [1571,] a dozen of soldiers came to Braid at supper-time, and spoiled the miller's house, the miller being at supper with the Laird; and when they saw the miller coming in, and staying them from spoiling his house, they took him and brought him to the gate of Braid, and gave the Laird injurious words, bidding him come out to Captain Melving, or else they should burn the house about his lugs. The Laird, being a quiet man, bade them depart, saying, that he had nothing to do with them; and that if Captain Melving would have had him, he had not sent such messengers as they were. They still continuing in their injurious language, and misusing the Laird's miller before his eyes, the Laird went out with a two-handed sword, (the rest of his [men] by occasion, hindered following as they might;) the soldiers, I say, for the most part of them, discharged their hagbutts at the Laird; but, by God's providence, he escaped their fury, and struck one of them *breadlings* with his sword to the earth, who cried, that he would be ta'en. Other two of them, having their pieces undischarged, (in the one of which there was three bullets,) and seeing one of their marrows dung to the ground, they discharge both at the Laird; yet, by God's eternal providence, he was so preserved, that he got no hurt, nor none of his, albeit they were all but [without] armour. But the skaith fell on themselves; for they slew their own man that had rendered himself to the Laird: other three, also, were ta'en, before whom this man confessed, that his own marrows slew him, for the Laird's company never shot a shot. And so the soldiers, when they had discharged their pieces, fled to the town, and made report, that the Laird of Braid had a company of men of war waiting for them. So the alarm struck, and all came forth to the Querrelholes, [Those quarries which are at the head of Burnts-

his death-bed, took leave of the Laird of Braid in this touching and affecting manner:—"The rest of the company having taken their leave of him, he said to the Laird of Braid, 'Every one bids me good-night, but when will you do it? I have been greatly indebted to you, for which I shall never be able to recompense you; but I commit you to one that is able to do it,— to the Eternal God.'"[1]

The lands of Braid have long passed from the Fairly family; and, as is the usual case with property near a metropolis, have changed hands repeatedly before arriving into those of the present possessor. But a much more remarkable change has been wrought upon the external appearance of the property within these thirty years, than any which could have arisen from a mere change of landlords. Before that period, the hills of Braid and Blackford were in the state of a wild sheep pasture, partly consisting of the softest and most verdant turf, covered with whins and broom, through which the grey faces of the rock showed themselves at intervals. Through this scene strayed the little rivulet in its narrow glen; into which, when his eye was satiated with the magnificent view from the hill, the stranger might descend, as into a silent and solitary scene, which might have been many miles distant from the abode of man. A natural alcove, or hollow in the rock, was a fa-

field Links]; but, hearing the truth, were staid by the Laird of Merchinston, who showed Captain Melving, that there were other men coming from Dalkeith for the Laird's relief, as they did with speed."—BANNATYNE's *Journal*, p. 172.

[1] M'Crie's *Life of John Knox*, vol. ii., p. 227.

vourite retreat of the High School boys; who, when tired with seeking birds' nests, or gathering wild berries, used to huddle themselves together in the cove, as it was called, and recount legends of the hermits who had dwelt there in Popish times, or of the more recent adventures of covenanted martyrs, supposed to have sought refuge in this sequestered spot from the sword of persecution. That the little hollow should have been the dwelling of an anchorite, is impossible; but there is more foundation for the other stories, since we read, that Mr John Dick, a zealous Covenanter, who left a very warm testimony against the corruptions and oppressions of the time, was apprehended when lurking about Braid s crags.

This wild scene, the refuge of persecuted fanatics in former days, and the retreat of truant schoolboys in our own remembrance, now exhibits a wonderful proof of the force of Scottish agriculture—every part of Blackford hill, excepting the naked crags themselves, being now subjected to the plough, and bearing excellent crops. An old man may feel some regret at the change of scene, and the destruction of the silvan retreats of his childhood, and repeat to himself the verse of Logan—

> " The cruel plough has razed the green,
> Where, when a child, I play'd;
> The axe has fell'd the hawthorn screen,
> The schoolboy's summer shade;"—

but no serious weight can be given to such lingering remembrances. The change wrought on these pastures does not resemble that, which, in more remote quarters, a hasty, avaricious, and indiscriminate

system of ploughing has effected, by tearing up the better part of sheep-pasture, destroying their natural and self-sown grasses, which no human art can restore, and, in order to attain a white crop or two, impoverishing for ever ground designed by nature for grazing-farms. The present case is widely different. The immense demand of the neighbouring city for every species of green crop, as well as for grain, renders it worth the agriculturist's while, at almost any expense, to turn into cultivation every inch of ground which can by any means be made productive. The increased extent of this demand can only be estimated by the rise of rents. Of the cultivated land, which is in the front of the view, much was let, within the memory of man, at two and three pounds per acre. When it rose to five pounds, it was considered impossible that the farmers could make good their engagements. It is now, in all cases, greatly above the last sum; and in some, we believe, it approaches to nine or ten pounds per acre. Yet, even in these disadvantageous times, the command of manure, and the immense demand for the produce, enable the farmers in the vicinity of Edinburgh to thrive under these enormous rents. By their potato crops alone, which are almost a burden upon more remote agriculturists, forty, fifty, and sixty pounds per acre have occasionally been obtained; and the same, or still more, has been gained by turnips—a species of crop equally necessary to the capital, and, like potatoes, not capable of being transported from a distance.

The canal from the west may be expected to

work some change in these prices; but it is probable, that the skill and capital of the Mid-Lothian farmers will enable them to stand their ground against distant competition, even when aided by water-carriage.

The space of ground which forms the front of the view, extending from the bottom of Blackford hill to the suburbs of Edinburgh, comprehends the greater part of the Borough Moor, or Common, which once belonged to the city of Edinburgh. This domain was a grant, it is said, of David I.; intended to supply the citizens with fuel—with pasturage for their cows—with stones, and with timber for building. The common was of great extent, comprehending almost all the lands on the south side of Edinburgh for two miles beyond the old walls; from the Sciennes on the east, to Merchiston on the west, the lands of Braid being its southern boundary. It was a large tract of ground, of various qualities, all of which is now become extremely valuable. At the time of King David's grant, the common was waste and forest land; and the imprudence of the magistrates was afterwards induced to obtain a grant for disposing of it, in feu, for such sums as they could obtain—thus parting, for a trifling immediate consideration, with an estate, which, if retained as public property, would have kept pace in value with the times, and at length must have furnished the city with a large and permanent revenue. The permission to feu the Borough Moor was granted by James IV., by a charter, dated 5th October, 1508. Soon after this, the citizens became desirous of destroying the

huge trees with which it was covered, and which it was alleged, formed a retreat for thieves and robbers. In order to encourage this devastation, the Town-Council permitted such of the inhabitants as might choose to purchase these trees, to project the fronts of their tenements fourteen feet beyond the line of the street; and hence was introduced the fashion of those projecting wooden booths, or *out-shots* as they are technically called, still to be seen in the fronts of the old houses of Edinburgh, which afford, by the singularity and intricacy of their outlines, very happy subjects for the pencil, but are, in every other point of view, mean and miserable contrivances.

The array of the Scottish army was held in the Borough-Moor in 1513, previous to the departure of James IV. for the fatal expedition, which terminated in the battle of Flodden. Notwithstanding the operations of the magistrates, the common was still at that time studded, as we are informed by the historians, with magnificent oaks. The Royal Standard of Scotland was fixed in a large upright stone, called the Hare-Stane,[1] at the place called Borough-moor-head, which still exists, though rendered less remarkable by being built into the wall,

[1] This word *Hare*, or *Har*, has been said to signify an army,—an interpretation which is adopted in the Notes upon the poem called *Marmion*. The learned William Hamper, Esq. of Birmingham, has sufficiently proved that the word refers to a boundary. The new explanation is particularly applicable to the Hare-Stane on the Borough-moor-head, as it stood on the western boundary of the Common, and in a situation well adapted for a land-mark, where the town's property marches with that of Merchiston.

which runs along the side of the footpath. At about half a mile's distance to the southward there is another stone, called the Buck-Stane, upon which the proprietor of the barony of Pennycuik is bound by his charter to place himself, and to wind three blasts of a horn, when the King shall visit the Borough-Moor—one of those whimsical tenures, by which the ancient feudal monarchs gratified at once their own vanity and that of the favoured vassal, who escaped from heavier services by such an act of public homage.

Considerably to the east of the Borough-moor-head, and about the centre of the View, once stood the chapel of Saint Roque, having a cemetery around it, in which were interred the citizens of Edinburgh who died of the plague. It is much to be wished, that this ground had been retained for the purpose of relieving the gorged and overloaded churchyards within the walls of the city. In 1532, four acres of land around the chapel were granted to Sir John Young, the chaplain, for the service of upholding it in a state for the performance of divine worship; and, till a very late period, Saint Roque continued to watch over the remains of her chapel (though very humble in point of architecture) with a jealousy which would have done honour to a saint of higher rank in the calendar. About the middle of last century, masons were employed to remove the ruins, but were so much daunted by the fall of a scaffold, and the mischief which followed, that even in Mr Arnott's time, the ruins were regarded with superstitious awe. They stood in the open field, (as the author of this de-

scription well remembers,) and exhibited an oblong square, without any architectural ornament; the windows and roof totally demolished, and the font-stone alone remaining, to mark that the place had been ever dedicated to the service of religion.[1] But on the commencement of the nineteenth century, Saint Roque proved unable to defend the ruins of her fane, amid the change of property and of scenery, which took place around them.

Previous to this period, those fields which formerly composed part of the Borough-Moor, were occupied solely for agriculture or pasture. The only houses which lay betwixt Braid Hills and Edinburgh, cottages excepted, were the house of Grange, an ancient mansion, deriving its name from having been the grange, or farm-house, belonging to the adjacent monastery of Saint Catharine of Sienna, or Sciennes, as the word has been corrupted, with one or two other ancient and solitary buildings, in the style of the seventeenth century. No citizen of Edinburgh dreamed at that time of a residence in the country, unless in the case of bad health, when one or other of these ancient mansions was occasionally occupied by an invalid. It may be noticed in particular, that the celebrated Principal Robertson died at the house of Grange, to which he had been recommended to retire for change of air.

It was about this time that Mr Dugald Stuart, in his beautiful letter upon the character and manners of Burns, introduces the interesting conver-

[1] [See, in Grose's *Antiquities of Scotland*, vol. i., p. 38, an engraving of the ruins of St Roque's Chapel.]

sation which took place betwixt the philosopher and the poet, during a morning walk upon Braid Hills.

"The variety of his engagements," says Mr Stuart, speaking of the poet, "prevented me from seeing him so often as I could have wished. In the course of the spring, he called upon me once or twice at my request, early in the morning, and walked with me to Braid Hills, in the neighbourhood of the town, when he charmed me still more by his private conversation than he had ever done in company. He was passionately fond of the beauties of nature; and I recollect once he told me, when I was admiring a distant prospect in one of our morning walks, that the sight of so many smoking cottages gave a pleasure to his mind, which none could understand who had not witnessed, like himself, the happiness and the worth which they contained."[1]

The view which excited the sympathies of the poet and philosopher, is now much altered by the very great number of villas and country boxes, which have sprung up betwixt the town and Braid Hills, dotting and chequering with their square enclosures and priggish architecture the whole space, which formerly presented so lonely an appearance, as led back the thoughts of the bard to the rural simplicity of his own country. This, however, is but a temporary evil. Trees are rising fast around these villas, and when they are partially hidden and overshaded, each by the

[1] Burns' *Works*, edited by Currie, Liverpool, 1800. Vol. i., p. 143.

trees and bushes of its own little pleasure-ground, the view will be more beautiful than it has ever been since the remote period when the Borough-Moor was overshadowed by mighty oaks. The change is material in another respect; as marking, namely, the increase of luxury and refinement in the commercial classes, by whom most of these boxes are tenanted, and whose predecessors were imprisoned for life within the darksome booths of the Old Town, while the sons require free air and relaxation, after a day spent in the ample mansions which decorate the bridges and the New Town.

THE CASTLE, FROM THE GRASSMARKET.

[CALLCOTT.]

THE *place*, or oblong square, which is here represented, lies in the hollow on the south side of the Castle-Hill, is adjacent to the West-Port of the city, and forms the Smithfield, as well as the Haymarket, of Edinburgh. There is a weekly market held here on Wednesday.

Formerly the Grassmarket was the place of public execution, and as criminals in London were conveyed from Newgate to Tyburn, the same sad procession was made in Edinburgh from the Tolbooth to this place; and the gibbet, which was

always put up and removed by night, was erected near to where Mr Callcott has placed a group of market-women conversing with a man on horseback. Over a dyer's pole, to the left of that spot, and behind the Highland piper, the mob, who mimicked as nearly as they could all the forms of ordinary justice, hanged the unhappy Captain Porteous on 7th September, 1736.[1]

On the right, the walls of the castle, with the precipitous rocks on which they are founded, rise to a dizzy height above the front of the view. Yet, steep as these rocks appear, love and ambition have found a path to scale them. The incident occurred in 1312-13, while the victorious Scots were in the course of recovering from the English invaders the fortresses and fastnesses which they had so long garrisoned, and the story is thus told by Barbour.

Thomas Randolph, nephew to Robert Bruce, and well known as the redoubted Earl of Moray, had approached the fortress of Edinburgh, where lay a strong English garrison under Piers Leland, a Lombard, with whom he had opened some communication. But the garrison suspecting the fidelity of their governor, thrust him into prison, and prepared to defend the impregnable fortress which they occupied, under the command of a gallant constable, whose name is not transmitted to us. As the earl, with a hopeless eye, surveyed the strength of the place, he was privily accosted by one of his own soldiers, named William Francis, an esteemed and gallant man. "Methinks, my

[1] [See *Heart of Mid-Lothian—Waverley Novels*, vol. xi.; *Tales of a Grandfather*, 3d *Series*, vol. ii., ch. v.]

lord," said he, "you would fain devise some means of entering yonder castle, and such can I procure for you with no greater aid than a twelve-foot ladder may afford. Know that my father was in his time keeper of yonder fortress, and that I, a wild gallant in my youth, loved *par amours* a fair woman in the town beneath. In order to obtain unsuspected access to her, I was wont to lower myself from the wall by night with the help of a ladder of ropes, and by means of a secret and precipitous path to descend these cliffs; and this I practised so oft, both in going and returning, that the darkest night was no obstacle to my venturing. If, therefore, it pleases you to assail the castle in this manner, I offer myself to be your guide, and the foremost on the expedition." The Earl of Moray received the proposal with joy, and the attempt was undertaken by thirty men, commanded by Randolph in person, and guided by Francis. The darkness of the night, the steepness of the precipice, the danger of discovery by the watchmen, and the slender support which they had to trust to in ascending from crag to crag, rendered the enterprise such as might have appalled the bravest spirit. When they had ascended half way, they found a flat spot, large enough to halt upon, and there sat down to recover their breath, and prepare for the farther part of their perilous expedition. While they were here seated, they heard the rounds or "check-watches," as Barbour calls them, pass along the walls above them; and it so chanced that one of the English soldiers, in mere wantonness and gaiety, hurled a stone down, and cried out at

the same time, "I see you well," although without an idea that there was any one beneath. The stone rolled down the precipice, and passed over the heads of Moray and his adventurous companions, as they sat cowering under the rock from which it bounded. They had the presence of mind to remain perfectly silent, and presently after the sentinels continued their rounds. The assailants then continued their ascent, and arrived in safety at the foot of the wall, which they scaled by means of the ladder which they brought with them. Francis, their guide, ascended first, Sir Andrew Gray was second, and Randolph himself was third. Ere they had all mounted, however, the sentinels caught the alarm, raised the cry of "treason," and the constable of the castle and others rushing to the spot, made a valiant, though ineffectual resistance. The Earl of Moray was for some time in great personal danger, until the gallant constable being slain, his followers fled or fell, and this strong castle remained in the hands of the assailants.

"A more desperate adventure was never achieved," says Barbour, "since Alexander, who conquered Babeloun, leapt headlong among his foemen from the wall of the town which he was beleaguering."—He adds, "that the holy Queen Margaret had, in the spirit of prophecy, announced this event, by causing to be painted in her chapel, (where the memorial is yet to be seen,) the representation of a man scaling a fortress by means of a ladder, with the legend, *Gardez vous de François*, which was long meant to predict the taking of the Maydin-Castle by the French, but was now fulfilled

in the achievement of William Francis, the daring guide of the Earl of Moray."—How Queen Margaret came to prophesy in French, Barbour did not enquire, or has not explained. The chapel alluded to was that within the Castle of Edinburgh, founded by Saint Margaret, the wife of Malcolm Canmore, whose name it still bears.

Such is the interesting history of a bold achievement; and by looking at the view the reader may estimate both the danger and difficulty which necessarily attended a nocturnal ascent from the neighbourhood of the Grassmarket to the walls of the castle.

HERIOT'S HOSPITAL, FROM THE WEST BOW.

[TURNER.]

HERIOT'S HOSPITAL, one of the proudest ornaments of Edinburgh, and equally distinguished for the purposes of the institution, and the excellence of the administration by which these purposes are obtained, was founded at the expense of a private citizen.

George Heriot (born in June, 1563) followed the trade and bore the name of his father, a goldsmith in Edinburgh, who was accounted at the time, a wealthy citizen. It appears, from his marriage-contract, (1586,) that George Heriot, the

son, had a stock in trade equal, in modern money, to L.200, and upwards. In 1597, he was appointed goldsmith to Queen Anne of Denmark; and soon afterwards received the same appointment in the royal household. Heriot followed his royal master to London, upon the union of the crowns; where doubtless his trade became much more profitable. He married a second time; and died in 1624, leaving what in those days must have been an immense fortune, and without any lawful issue to inherit his wealth.[1]

The will of this opulent citizen, after various legacies and provisions, bequeathed all the residue of his estate to the provost, magistrates, ministers, and ordinary council of the town of Edinburgh, in order to found an hospital, for the maintenance, relief, bringing-up, and education, of as many poor fatherless boys, sons of freemen of the city of Edinburgh, as the bequest might furnish means for. By another clause, the same persons are required, at the expense of the foundation, to maintain ten bursaries (scholarships), at the University of Edinburgh, for the education of so many poor scholars. The sum which the magistrates received for these purposes, after all the legacies and encumbrances upon the residuary estate had been cleared off,

1 [Heriot was married first to Christian, daughter of Simon Marjoribanks, a wealthy Burgess of Edinburgh; and next, in 1608, to Alison, eldest daughter of James Primrose, clerk to the Privy-Council, and grandfather to the first Earl of Rosebery. For the bequest of his entire fortune, estimated about L.50,000, and probably equivalent to L.200,000 in the present times—See *Memoirs of George Heriot*, 12mo, Edinburgh, 1822, drawn up by the late Mr A. Constable.]

amounted to L.23,625, being probably about one half of the property of the munificent and wealthy founder.

The present noble pile of building was erected after the plan, it is said, of Inigo Jones; but there is a tradition, that it was considerably altered to suit the peculiar taste of the Rev. Dr Walter Balcanqual, who appears to have been the most active of the executors under Heriot's last will, and to whose wisdom he intrusted the care of drawing up articles, or statutes, for the regulation of the Hospital. The building consists of a quadrangle, with large square towers at each angle. The north front has a central tower higher than the rest, under which an archway leads to the inner court, which is adorned with the statue of the founder. Upon the birthday of George Heriot, the children enjoy a holiday, and display much skill and taste in decorating with flowers the effigy of their benefactor. The south front presents also a circular tower, with Gothic windows, which serve to light a handsome chapel. The style of architecture is of that mixed sort which began to prevail about the reign of Elizabeth, and of which Northumberland House, in the Strand, is one among many examples. It is said, that Dr Balcanqual insisted, that the architraves and ornaments of each particular window should differ in some particular or other from those of all the rest; but such was the skill and management of the architect, that though these distinctions can easily be observed on close examination, the front, viewed as a whole, presents the appearance of perfect uni-

formity. Handsome gardens are annexed to the establishment, which were once used as public walks. Dr Pitcairn lays several of the scenes of his satirical drama, called the "Assembly," written soon after the Revolution, in Heriot's gardens. But these promenades have been long abolished.

The purchase of the land on which it stands, called the High Riggs, extending to eight acres and upwards, was made on 6th February, 1628, for 7650 merks of Scottish money. The foundation-stone was laid 1st July, 1628.

Soon after this splendid building was finished, the great Civil War broke out, and the first inmates of Heriot's Work, as it is called, were the sick and wounded of Cromwell's army, when he took possession of Edinburgh in 1650, after the battle of Dunbar. The Hospital continued to be occupied as a military hospital until 1658, when Monk, then anxious to ingratiate himself with the Scottish nation, removed its military inhabitants, to make room for those for whom the building had been erected. Thirty boys were admitted into the Hospital, 11th April, 1659, and ten more on the 8th of August following. The number maintained has since varied according to the funds of the establishment, and amounts now to one hundred and eighty.

A short time after the Restoration, the youthful community of Heriot's Hospital are said to have incurred the censure of the existing powers on the following whimsical occasion:—The test was at that time imposed on all persons in public offices; and our readers cannot have forgotten, that the

Earl of Argyll was involved in a most oppressive trial and conviction for high treason, not because he refused that oath, but because he took it with the qualifying phrase, " so far as the said oath was consistent with itself, and with the Protestant religion." Even " iron-witted clowns, and unrespective boys," could see and ridicule the absurd reason which construed this reservation into a crime. The boys of Heriot's Hospital are said to have voted, that the large mastiff, kept for the protection of the garden, enjoyed an office of public trust; and, accordingly, they tendered him the test-oath, fairly written out on a sheet of paper, which the dog having smelled to, did reject the same. It was a second time tendered to the Hospital Cerberus, having been previously buttered; upon which, as the dog licked the writing over, he fell under the censure of taking the oath with a reservation, and was only saved from the death of a traitor by the intervention of his comrade, the two-legged porter. The thing is said to have made some noise at the time; and, as raillery is never so sorely felt as when it is deserved, the magistrates are supposed to have made the young wags smart for their jest.

Since the Hospital was opened, in 1658, the number of the orphan sons of burgesses educated together in this noble seminary has varied from time to time. The diet of these boys is plain and substantial; their dress uniform and simple, without being cut in any absurd or antiquated fashion; and the discipline so good, that their morals are generally void of reproach. The following account of their education, and the other advantages afford-

ed them, is furnished by an intelligent friend, who, as an active magistrate of Edinburgh, is well acquainted with the management of the Hospital:—

"The establishment at present maintains 180 boys, none of whom are sent to the High School, as formerly, but they are taught by most approved teachers, English, Latin, Greek, writing, book-keeping, arithmetic, mathematics, &c. If the professions chosen by the boys, on their leaving the Hospital, require the knowledge of drawing or navigation, &c., upon their applying to the governors, they are sent to able teachers to be taught such branches as their particular destination may require. It must be observed, that by the statutes, the boys are required *to be taught in the Hospital to read and write Scots distinctly, and cast all manner of accounts; as also the Latin rudiments, but no farther.* Such of the boys as prove to be hopeful scholars, and are inclined to follow any of the learned professions, such as divinity, law, or physic, are sent to the college with an allowance of L.30 sterling yearly, for four years, stipulating them to appear annually, previous to the commencement of the winter session, before the Education Committee of the Institution, that they may be satisfied as to their progress. There are generally from six to eight of the youths attending the University, independent of the ten bursars provided for by the will of the donor, who are selected by the governors from scholars, sons of parents who are unable to give them a college education, and not connected with the Hospital. They are now

allowed L.20 sterling yearly for four years. They also are bound to appear annually before the Education Committee, and if it appears that they have not been diligent, their bursary is discontinued.

" The boys who are bound out to trades, &c. are allowed L.10 sterling yearly, for five years, in name of apprentice-fee, and at the expiry of their indenture, on producing a certificate from their master, that they have served out their time faithfully, they are allowed L.5 sterling to purchase a suit of clothes. The amount of apprentice-fee, and the number of boys maintained, have been increased from time to time. In the year 1813, thirty additional boys were admitted, and the apprentice-fee advanced from L.25 to L.50 sterling. Five more boys have been admitted this present year [1821.]

" Maitland's *History of Edinburgh* makes the sum total, for erecting and endowing the present Hospital, to be L.43,608, 11s. 3d. sterling.

The author may be permitted to add, from juvenile recollection, that this little community have, amongst others of their own age, a character in some degree peculiar to themselves, and are, generally speaking, bold, hardy, and ingenious beyond their years.

They are now taught Latin and Greek within the establishment, as above mentioned; but formerly there was a provision for such lads attending the High School of Edinburgh, as were to receive these branches of instruction, which brought them into contact with boys of a higher rank, and otherwise circumstanced. These *Herioters*, as they were termed, were never treated with any aristocratic

scorn by the other pupils who attended the same class. Indeed, they would not have brooked any thing approaching to it, for they had a strong *esprit de corps;* and the author can remember, that when one of them had received some real or imaginary offence, the whole Hospital took the matter up, and it was like to become the subject of a serious feud betwixt the High School boys and the Hospitallers, had it not been adjusted by compromise. The Herioters had also peculiar skill in making balls, rackets, clacking-boards, and other implements of boyish amusement—a talent which gained them consideration, as well as a little money. We have already noticed their art of disposing of flowers; for which purpose they were usually called upon to assist at decorating the statue of Charles II., and the Gothic roof of the Parliament House, upon occasions of public rejoicing. Most of them carry into life the same firmness and intelligence of character. The Hospital has furnished many respectable, and some eminent names; and they are, in general, much attached to the place, and to the memory of the founder.

It is generally allowed, that the internal management of the Hospital, under its various treasurers, and as controlled by the magistrates of Edinburgh, has been highly creditable. But charges have been brought against the magistrates, that, upon one highly important occasion, they were guilty of sacrificing the interests of the Hospital to those of the city. The case stands thus:—

With other valuable landed property, lying immediately around the city of Edinburgh, the

Hospital possessed the whole of that extensive plain, to the north of the city, on which the New Town now stands. This property the trustees of the Hospital—the magistrates, namely, and ministers of Edinburgh—sold for a large sum of money to the city, when the speculation of building a New Town upon that site was first adopted. The transaction was one of some delicacy, since the magistrates may be said to have acted in some degree in the double character of sellers and purchasers; and it has been hastily and injuriously urged, that whatever advantage the estate of the Good Town may have acquired by the transaction, must have been just so much advantage gained at the expense of the Hospital. But this reasoning, upon being more closely examined, will be found erroneous. To execute such a speculation as the erection of a New Town, was a task far beyond the duties and powers of the trustees of the Hospital. There was a chartered extension of the city's bounds, and of its rights to be procured, for the encouragement of settlers; there was property to be bought, roads to be made, levelling and other expensive operations to be undertaken, before there could be expected the least prospect of any valuable return. To have directed the funds of the Hospital to such a purpose, would have been both unjust and criminal; and it was therefore clear, that while the ground continued the property of the Hospital, the proposed plan could not be executed at all, and the site for the intended New Town could not have been obtained. The transaction, thus considered, seems to have been fair and beneficial, as

well to the Hospital, who obtained a price for their property much above what corresponded with any revenue they could themselves derive from it;—to the magistrates, as administrators for the city, who acquired the means of carrying through a most important train of improvements, and at the same time augmented the common good, or municipal property;—and to the public, because the acquisition of that property by the magistrates, and its being included in the extended royalty, were indispensably necessary to the very existence of those splendid improvements, which have elevated Edinburgh into one of the most magnificent cities in Europe.

To return to the external appearance of the building, and internal arrangement of the whole administration, it would perhaps be difficult to show an establishment of the kind, comprehending so much of external grandeur and of real utility, as the foundation of George Heriot.

The West Bow, from the lower part of which the view is taken, was, until the South Bridge was built, the only passage (and it was a most steep and difficult one) by which a wheel-carriage could attain the High Street of Edinburgh; for Saint Mary's Wynd, through which with great care it was possible to ascend in a carriage, only connected with the Canongate.

The inhabitants of the Bow were chiefly artisans, and the trade of white-smiths predominated among them to such a degree, that it was said the inhabitants could not sleep on the Sabbath mornings, for want of the clatter of hammers, which they were

familiarized with on the other days of the week. The matrons of the Bow were distinguished for their religious zeal, and, as we observe from the satirical poems of the time, most violent Covenanters. The "Bowhead saints," and "the godly plants of the Bowhead," are the frequent subject of mirth to Pitcairn, Pennycuik, and other wags of the cavalier or Jacobite faction. This precise generation were much scandalized by the backsliding of their neighbour, the celebrated Major Weir, who, after living a life of rigorous profession, was burned for incest and sorcery in 1676, after confessing a great many impossible crimes, besides some others that were at least improbable. His house, in a small close leading straight downwards from the second turn of the Bow, long stood empty, and was believed to be haunted.[1] In the Bow, also, flourished of old one Mitchell, a curious mixture of madness, knavery, absurdity, and something like humour. He was a white-smith, and published various lucubrations under the title of the Tinclarian Doctor.

Near the bottom of this steep and crooked street, are several lofty *lands*, or nests of houses, each marked with a cross placed on the chimney, or on the front of their gables. These having been erected upon lands originally belonging to the Knights Templars, came at length to be united to the barony of Drem. This was a great vexation to the magistrates of Edinburgh, for the Baron of Drem having a separate jurisdiction independent of theirs, these houses became a place of refuge to artizans, who were not free of the city corporations,

[1] [See Chambers' *Minor Antiquities of Edinburgh*, p. 82, &c.]

besides the insult of the Baron of Drem's bailie holding independent courts within their jurisdiction. After a considerable sum had been offered by the city, and refused by the baron, this petty jurisdiction, with others of the same class, was, by the Act 1748, abolishing all heritable jurisdictions in Scotland, taken away, without costing the community any compensation whatever.

EDINBURGH, FROM THE GLASGOW ROAD.

[NASMYTH.]

THIS view offers little room for description, though in itself eminently beautiful. It is indeed the particular excellence of the scenery in the vicinity of the Scottish capital, that the same objects present such new, unexpected, and interesting combinations, when viewed from different points. That at present selected is from the new buildings on the lands of Coates, where the New Town is presently extending itself in a south-westerly direction. The Castle-rock, as it stoops precipitously to the westward, forms the principal feature in the view; and sublime as it is, sustains injury, if not degradation, in being made the pedestal for that ugly and clumsy pile of barracks, which would be honoured by a comparison with the most vulgar cotton-mill. A few hundred pounds, nay, the expenditure of the

same money which this deplorable mass actually cost to the public, if laid out under the control of the most ordinary degree of taste, might have saved Edinburgh Castle, that ancient and martial Acropolis of Caledonia, from the imposition of that hulk, which even Nasmyth's pencil, aided by the palliating effects of distance and of mist, cannot divest of its lumpish deformity.

The West Church, or Saint Cuthbert's, is another clumsy structure, but fortunately stands much out of sight. A circumstance happened with respect to this church, and to more than one besides, which singularly illustrates the proverb, that Scotsmen are ever wise behind the hand. When the heritors had chosen the cheapest, or at least the ugliest plan which was laid before them, had seen it executed, and were at leisure to contemplate the ground cumbered with a great heavy oblong barn, with huge disproportioned windows, they repented of the enormity which they had sanctioned, and endeavoured to repair their error by building a steeple, in a style of ornamented and florid architecture; as if the absurd finery of such an appendage could relieve the heaviness of the principal building, which is only rendered more deformed by the contrast. It may be hoped, that the number of excellent architects who have lately arisen in this country will introduce a better taste among their patrons; and it would be especially desirable to convince those concerned, that beauty or elegance in architecture depends not upon ornament, but upon symmetry; and that in truth, a handsome and tasteful plan may often be executed at less

expense than one which shall, so long as the building stands, entail disgrace on all who have had to do with it.

The very handsome Episcopal chapel of Saint John's, which is a beautiful specimen of modern Gothic, rises on the left of the West Kirk with an air of superior elegance, which, in a former day, might have drawn down the wrath of the zealous and predominant Presbyterians. But although doubtless equally sincere in their faith as their fathers, the modern Calvinists no longer mingle with their own religious zeal, any animosity against those of other congregations.

At the hollow beneath the West Kirk, the North Loch once commenced. But there is strong reason to believe, that the water there collected was an artificial inundation, formed by means of an artificial dike near the bottom of Leith Wynd; and intended, by stopping the course of the small rivulets arising near the foot of the castle-rock, to save the expense of fortification on that side of the city. Bowyer, the continuator of Fordun's Chronicle, mentions, that in the year 1398, Queen Annabel, wife of Robert the Third, proclaimed a tournament of twelve knights on each side, in honour of her eldest son David, then created Duke of Rothsay; and adds, in express words—"Hujusmodi tyrocinium fuit centique a parte aquilonali villæ de Edinburgh, *ubi nunc est lacus.*" Besides the direct testimony of the historian, it may be added, that the bottom of the North Loch, though it latterly became soft and marshy by continual deposition of owze and filth, was originally hard, so that it could be forded both by men and horses. After

the celebrated skirmish fought betwixt the factions of Angus and Arran upon the High Street of Edinburgh, and hence popularly termed *Clean the Causeway*, Archbishop Beatoun, who had inflamed the broil, and indeed had assisted in it, wearing armour under his rocket, could only escape from the fury of the victorious Douglasses, by traversing a ford in the North Loch. These, with other circumstances mentioned by Maitland in his History of Edinburgh, go to establish the fact, that this lake was artificial, and constructed for the defence of the city upon the northern side, where there was no wall.

EDINBURGH, FROM CORSTORPHINE HILL.

[THOMSON.]

THE Corstorphine Hills, taking their name from the village so called, form a beautiful screen of eminences, rising about three miles to the north-west of Edinburgh, and producing the same effect with that of the Surrey Hills, as seen from Saint James's Park. They are chiefly clothed with wood, and rising from the verge of the great valley which stretches towards Stirling, they take their direction towards the Frith of Forth, and again sink into lower ground, near the House and Park of Barnton, belonging to the late George Ramsay, Esq.

The view from these hills is one of the most magnificent in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh.

The prospect abounds also with objects of curiosity, both to the antiquary, the philosopher, and the man of taste. The new mansion of Ravelstone is the seat of Sir Alexander Keith, Knight-Mareschal of Scotland; and the old house, situated close beneath it, is preserved with great judgment and taste, as a model of the style of building, of laying out gardens, &c., as practised in Scotland three hundred years since. Craig-Crook Castle, an ancient mansion, formerly noted for the tales of terror and superstition connected with it, and at present more honourably distinguished as the residence of Francis Jeffrey, Esq.,[1] is also an interesting object in the view.

EDINBURGH, FROM THE CALTON-HILL

[TURNER.]

THE pencil of our celebrated associate Turner, has here given a daring representation of one of the most magnificent scenes in this romantic city. A few years ago the Calton-Hill was a solitary eminence, distinguished only by the Observatory, and the Bridewell, which had been erected there,

[1] [Late Lord Advocate—now (1834) Lord Jeffrey—one of the Judges in the Court of Session.]

after plans of the late Mr Adams. A walk, little frequented save by strangers, winded around the verge of the precipitous hill, and showed, in pleasing succession, a noble view of the Forth, with the mountains beyond it,—of Leith, and its shipping,—of Musselburgh Bay, and the fine eastern crescent of land, terminated so happily by North Berwick Law,—of Arthur's Seat and Salisbury Crags, with the towers of the old Palace, and its huge quadrangular court lying close under the eye of the spectator,—of the massive and high-piled buildings of the Old Town, terminated by the Castle, and backed by the blue range of the Pentland Hills,—and, finally, as the spectator returned towards the point from which he set out, he commanded a view of the New Town, with the minarets of the Register House, and the grand arches of the North Bridge. The promenade, in its successive richness of beautiful objects, and the numerous moral associations which they are calculated to excite, is perhaps unequalled in Europe, or in the world. It was solitary, however, and little frequented, until the daring spirit of modern improvement suggested the magnificent plan of leading the principal approach to Edinburgh from the eastward along the verge of this commanding eminence. This has been done with a spirit which cannot be sufficiently admired, considering that it was exerted during the last years of an almost ruinous war; and that, at a time of scarcity and depression of credit, it served to feed the industrious poor, while it displayed the resources and courage of the wealthy.

In fact, by casting a stately and magnificent

bridge over the hollow betwixt the termination of Prince's Street and the Burial-Ground on the Calton, these points were connected at nearly the same level, while the traveller from the eastward, beginning to rise near the Piershill Barracks, gained the verge of the Calton-Hill almost without a perceptible ascent; and thus a road, which apparently led straight over a lofty mountain, has been rendered by skill the most level and easy, as well as the most splendid approach which was ever made to any city.

The new Jail, and public buildings of a similar description connected with it, being erected on the Calton-Hill at the same time, and forming a part of the generous plan which had been adopted, were constructed on the same liberal and magnificent scale. There was indeed so little reason to reproach the persons concerned with debasing, by mean or heavy buildings, the romantic site where they were erected, that we have heard the architecture of those structures censured as too fantastic, and abounding too much in the caprices of the Gothic style. We cannot concur in this objection to any extent. The buildings are very large, and the importance which their size attaches to them admits of their being diversified, without being degraded, by great variety of outline. And surely, if the massive, yet irregular, style of a Gothic castle can be any where adopted with propriety, the jail of a metropolis, built on the very verge of a precipice, and overhanging the buildings beneath, like an ancient citadel, is the most appropriate subject for the purpose.

Sir William Rae, Baronet, of Saint Catherine's,

(presently Lord Advocate, then Sheriff-Depute of Mid-Lothian,) and Sir John Marjoribanks, Baronet, of Lees, then Lord Provost, will be long remembered as the active public officers, whose good taste and patriotism (contending with, and surpassing, numerous obstacles,) commenced and carried through these magnificent improvements. Mr Elliot was the architect of the public works, and Mr Stevenson the surveyor and engineer.

The point which Mr Turner has selected for the view is precisely that upon which every passenger, however much accustomed to the wonderful scene, is inclined to pause, and, with eyes unsatisfied with seeing, to gaze on the mingled and almost tumultuous scene which lies before and beneath him. The building on the left is the City Jail, erected, as we have said, on a Gothic model, and adjoining to the Calton burial-ground, where the monument of David Hume, the historian and philosopher, in form of a round tower of massive Roman architecture, connects itself with the buildings of the jail. The eye is from thence led on along the Regent's Bridge, the magnificent work which connects the approach with the New Town, beyond which are seen the turrets of the Register House. The North Bridge, with the new buildings erected on the west side, (the subject of much controversy, but here, at least, seen to advantage,) unites these objects with the deep masses of the Old Town, and the castle predominating over the whole. The steeples of the West Kirk and Saint John's Chapel, with the cupola of Saint George's Church, terminate the view.

ENTRANCE TO LEITH HARBOUR.

[CALLCOTT.]

LEITH may be considered as the seaport of Edinburgh, from which it is distant only two miles, and the road between them is nearly covered with buildings. The Water of Leith, at its confluence with the Frith of Forth, which forms the harbour, divides the town into two parts, which are respectively called North and South Leith, and are connected together by drawbridges.

The civil and political history of Leith being intimately united with that of Edinburgh, the principal events will be found in the general accounts of the latter.

It appears that in the year 1544, King Henry the Eighth, disappointed at the treaty being declared void, which he had recently made with the Scots, respecting the infant Queen Mary, sent a fleet under the Earl of Hertford into the Forth, took Leith, destroyed the pier, and carried off the ships; in May the next year, a reinforcement from France arrived at Leith, under the command of Lorge Montgomery, and soon afterwards it was fortified to keep up a communication with France, which, however, did not prevent the English fleet from approaching it in 1549, and seizing some ships. The following year the fortifications of Leith were strengthened, and it resisted every attack that could be made upon it during a siege

of two months, when, in consequence of the death of the Regent, negotiations were entered into with the English, by which the French troops were removed, and Leith was demolished.

The importance of Leith, in consequence of its being the channel for the admission of foreign troops and supplies, made the possession of it an object with the conflicting parties during the turbulent period of the Reformation, and the subsequent contests for ascendency between the supporters and the enemies of the Stuart family, in the seventeenth century, and until they subsided generally at the union of the two kingdoms; since which event, both Edinburgh and Leith, have increased in magnitude and importance to the present time.

The public buildings in Leith for ecclesiastical, charitable, civil, and commercial purposes, also for the promotion of education and literature, are numerous; particular descriptions of which will be met with in the local accounts of the place. The streets are narrow, and irregular, though the modern parts of the town are built in a regular and highly improved style.

There are several manufactures in Leith, and it carries on a considerable trade with the principal ports of Europe, also with America, the West Indies, Ireland, &c., and several vessels are engaged in the Greenland Fishery; it has an extensive coasting trade, and employs twenty-seven smacks in the London trade alone, which sail regularly twice a-week; to which may be added several large

and elegant steam-vessels for conveying passengers to and from London.

The trade of Leith having greatly increased for some years back, two docks, each 250 yards long, and 100 wide, enclosing more than ten acres of water, and capable of containing 150 vessels of the classes that frequent that port, were completed in 1806 and 1817; and on the north side of them are three dry or graving docks; in addition to which, it is intended to form a large wet dock, 500 yards long, and 100 wide, extending to the tide-harbour at Newhaven, capable of receiving large ships; these, with other improvements of the harbour, were projected by that eminent civil engineer, the late John Rennie, Esq.

A lighthouse, with reflecting lamps, is erected at the mouth of the harbour, and another, with a revolving light, on the island of Inchkeith in the middle of the Frith of Forth, about four miles from Leith. The Custom-house, erected in 1812, stands on the north of the harbour, near the entrance to the wet docks.

The foreign trade of Leith for 1825 was as follows:—

Ships inwards, 368. Ships outwards, 272.

The coasting trade for 1825 was—

Ships inwards, 3794, containing 240,628 tons.
Ships outwards, 2271, containing 160,603 tons.

The harbour, the entrance to which is the subject of the annexed view, is formed by a noble

stone pier, built at the beginning of the last century, and is defended by a Martello tower, situated about a quarter of a mile from the pier, and erected during the late war.

Leith is governed by a magistrate of Edinburgh, who has the title of Admiral of Leith, and two resident bailies, elected by the Town-Council of Edinburgh. The population of North and South Leith together, is about 21,000, [by the last census in 1831,—25,855.]

HOLYROOD HOUSE.

[E. BLORE.]

THIS venerable seat of Scottish royalty, as is still expressed in its ordinary name, The abbey, was originally a convent, and, like so many other monastic establishments, calls David I. its founder. The legend connected with its foundation is well known, and its memory is preserved in the armorial bearings of the borough of Canongate to this day. The King, it seems, in or about the year 1128, as he was hunting in the forest of Drumselch, now Drumsheuch, was attacked by a stag which had been brought to bay, thrown to the ground, and in danger of perishing, when a cross was suddenly interposed betwixt the defenceless monarch and the

incensed animal, at the sight of which the stag fled in dismay. The cross, the substance of which could not be ascertained, remained on the place, and was regarded, of course, with the highest veneration.

In consequence of his escape from this imminent danger, the grateful Monarch founded and richly endowed the Church of the Holy Rood, granting to it and to the canons regular of Saint Augustine serving God therein, the privilege of erecting a borough betwixt their church and the Nether-Bow gate of the city, which is now called from thence the Canongate, but was formerly denominated the Herbargeire (or Hospitium) of the Monastery. In like manner he conferred on them those mills near Broughton, still well known by the name of Canon-mills. He bestowed on them also the churches of the Castle of Edinburgh, of Saint Cuthberts, Libberton, and Corstorphine, and of Airth, in the county of Stirling. His gratitude also assigned to them the right of trial by duel or ordeal, an extensive jurisdiction, with a variety of advantages, immunities, and privileges, which placed the Canons of Holyrood upon a footing with the most favoured ecclesiastics in Scotland. One of the most singular gifts comprehends the tithe of the whales and sea-monsters accruing to the crown on the whole coast betwixt the mouth of the river Almond to Colbrand's path. Succeeding monarchs heaped favours on the same establishment; so that, at the dissolution, it was accounted the most opulent Abbey in Scotland. The rental then consisted of four hundred and forty-two bolls of wheat, six hundred and forty bolls of bear, five hundred capons, two dozen

of hens, two dozen of salmon, twelve loads of salt, a great number of swine, and about two hundred and fifty pounds sterling in money.

The external appearance of the church and monastery of Holyrood, probably corresponded with these ample revenues; but it does not exactly appear how soon any part of the building was adapted to the purposes of a royal residence. Its vicinity to the King's Park, and to the hills, then covered with wood, must have recommended it at least as an occasional residence, whenever the perils of the time did not require the sovereign to immure himself within the Castle of Edinburgh. The poems of Dunbar seem to show that the Abbey was inhabited by James IV. as a permanent residence. It is ascertained, however, by an inscription upon the building, that the tower and high-roofed buildings, containing what are called Queen Mary's apartments, were built by James V. His name may still be seen at the bottom of a niche in the north-western tower.

Not long after their erection, these royal apartments, as well as the whole abbey, fell a prey to the flames, when the English landed at Royston Bay in 1544, took Leith, and attacked Edinburgh. Being repulsed from the city by a well-directed fire from the castle, they avenged themselves on the palace and abbey, which they burned, leaving nothing uninjured save the church, then a fine Gothic edifice. A fine brazen font was carried off by Sir Richard Lee, captain of the English pioneers, who, after adorning it with an inscription, somewhat in the vein of Ancient Pistol, presented

the same to the Church of Saint Albans, in Hertfordshire. The dedication is worthy of being preserved.

" Cum Læthia, oppidum apud Scotus non incelebre, et Edinburgus, primaria apud eos civitas, incendio conflagrent, Ricardus Leus, eques auratus, me flammis ereptum ad Anglos perduxit. Hujus ego tanti beneficii memor, non nisi regum liberos lavare solitus, nunc meam operam etiam in fines Anglorum libenter condixi. Leux victor sic voluit. Vale. Anno Domini M.D.XLIII. et anno Henrici Octavi XXXVI." Englished thus by Maitland :— " When Leith, a town of good account in Scotland, and Edinburgh, the principal city of that nation, were on fire, Sir Richard Lea, Knight, saved me out of the flames and brought me into England. In gratitude to him for his kindness, I, who heretofore served only at the baptism of kings, do now most willingly offer the same service even to the meanest of the English nation. Lea the conqueror hath so commanded. Adieu. A.D. 1543, in the thirty-sixth year of Henry VIII."—MAITLAND'S *Hist. of Edin.*, p. 148. The font fell into the hands of the Roundheads during the Civil War, and was destroyed by them for the sake of the metal.

Both the abbey and palace soon recovered from the effects of this disaster; for before gunpowder was much employed, the Gothic edifices suffered little from fire save the demolition of the roofs. Holyrood soon after became a building consisting of so many as five courts, and was the principal residence of the court, and scene of all important

public transactions, during the reign of Queen Mary and her son. The monastery was suppressed, with others, at the Reformation; and in the year 1636, the city of Edinburgh acquired the superiority of the Canongate from the family of Roxburgh, into whose hands it had passed, and thus abolished the inconvenient and disrespectable existence of a jurisdiction in that burgh, or suburb, independent of their own; but the building was retained as a royal residence.

When James VI. inhabited the palace, it was more than once attacked, and once actually surprised by Bothwell, in the course of his ambitious enterprises;[1] for the royal residence of a Scottish monarch was as liable as those of his barons to be disturbed by violence and bloodshed. Against such attempts it was strongly secured by a gateway, extending along the foot of the Canongate, which covered the main entrance, and by walls and enclosures on the other three sides. The gateway or porch, by which, from its position, admittance was given to the palace in front, was pulled down

[1] [" Francis Stewart, second Earl of Bothwell, and the son of John Stewart, first Earl, who was a natural son of King James V. He made several violent attempts to seize the person of the king. Being favoured by some of James's attendants, he was admitted by a secret passage, under cloud of night, into the court of the palace, 27th December, 1591, and advanced directly towards the royal apartment; but the alarm was taken, and the doors shut. While he attempted to burst open some of them, and to set fire to others, the citizens of Edinburgh had time to run to their arms, and he escaped with the utmost difficulty. Bothwell was attainted, banished, and died in contempt and exile."—Wood's *Peerage*, vol. i., p. 232.]

early in the last century; so that the palace is now approached obliquely, and the north-west wing is the first that becomes visible. This is one instance amongst many of a rage for demolition, without even the pretence of improvement, by which official persons are sometimes actuated.

When James acceded to the English crown, he left his ancient palace to dust and desolation. He revisited it indeed in 1617, after fourteen years absence, and it was then, for the first time, that the Episcopal service of the reformed church, with vocal and instrumental music, was performed at the Chapel of Holyrood. But the stern reformers of the preceding age had not viewed the mass itself as a greater abomination than did the Presbyterians of the 17th century regard the surplices and chants of the choristers. Their astonishment and horror are described, with some humour, by Sir Anthony Welldon, in an account of Scotland, or rather a satire upon that country, written at the time of the royal visit. "His Majesty's hangings," says the satirist, "they desire may be left as relics, to put them in mind of his Majesty, and they promise to dispense with the wooden images; but these graven images in this new beautiful chapel they threaten to pull down after his departure, and to make them a burnt-offering to appease the indignation they imagine conceived against them in the breast of the Almighty, for suffering such idolatry to enter their kingdom. The organ, I think, will find mercy, because they think there is some affinity betwixt it and the bagpipes. The skipper that brought the singing men with

their papistical vestments, complains that he has been much troubled with a strange singing in his head ever since they came on board his ship. For remedy whereof, the parson of the parish hath persuaded him to sell that profane vessel, and to distribute the money among the faithful brethren. - - - - - - To conclude, I am persuaded if God and his angels at the last day should come down in their whitest garments, they would run away, and cry, 'The children of the chapel are come again to torment us!—Let us fly from the abomination of these boys, and hide ourselves in the mountains!'"[1]

The great Civil War was not concluded, when the ancient Palace of Holyrood House was destroyed, either by wilful or accidental fire, while a body of English soldiers were quartered there. The circumstance is thus mentioned in the Diary of Andrew Nicol, amongst the remarkable events of 1650, the most disastrous year which Scotland had seen since the wars of Bruce and Baliol:—"The body of the Englisch army being thus quartered in Edinburgh, Cannogait, Leith, and in several other partes of Lowthiane, and a number of the Englisches futemen being lodged within the Abbey of Haly-Rud hous, it fell out that upon ane Weddensday, being the thretene day of October, 1650, the haill royal part of that palaice wes put in a flame, and brent to the grund on all the pairtis thereof, except a lyttill."—The small part which is here stated to have escaped the conflagration was the double tower upon the north-west, with the

[1] Secret History of James I.

adjoining building, containing the apartments of Queen Mary, which is now the lodging of the Duke of Hamilton, as Keeper of the Palace.

After monarchy was restored, Charles the Second showed a liberal attention to the condition of his ancient metropolis. A new palace, built upon the site of the former, and connected with its venerable relics, was erected, after the plan of Sir William Bruce of Kinross, by Robert Milne, the King's mason. The work, though in the French taste of Louis XIV.'s reign, does honour both to the architect and the builder. It is a quadrangle, built around a central court, surrounded with piazzas. The front is very handsome. It is two stories high, and flat in the roof, closing the inner court as with a screen, and giving access to it under a handsome cupola, surmounted by an imperial crown, executed in stone work. At each angle of the front the building projects and rises above the line, being decorated with turrets at the angles. The other three sides of the palace are three stories high, but plain and unornamented.

The attention of Charles was also turned to the abbey-church, which he fitted up anew as a chapel-royal, to be set apart in future for the use of the royal family—the installation of the Knights of the Thistle—and other occasions of regal solemnity. A throne was erected for the sovereign, and stalls for twelve knights of the order; an organ was again introduced, and the whole interior of the chapel was, at considerable expense, put into complete repair. But it was again destined to feel the violating rage of civil discord.

James II., or VII. of Scotland, resided long at the Abbey of Holyrood House ere he succeeded to the throne, kept a vice-regal court there, and by his stately and formal courtesy towards the proud aristocracy of Scotland, laid the foundation of that attachment to his person and family, which showed itself in so many unsuccessful insurrections. He bequeathed, as Duke of York, his name to the Duke's Walk, a level space extending from the back front of the palace to the verge of the park, and once shaded with lofty trees, which are now felled. For a long time this was the usual place in which the gentlemen of Edinburgh were wont to decide affairs of honour.

But though James contributed something to the splendour of the palace of his ancestors, he was finally the cause of its being ruined through the same obstinate bigotry by which he forfeited three kingdoms. When he ascended the throne, amongst other injudicious measures in favour of Popery, he thought proper not only to have mass celebrated in the chapel-royal at Holyrood House, but also to establish a Roman Catholic printing-press and Popish schools there. These acts of bigotry drew down the displeasure of the people at once upon the government and the very building itself, which was doubly odious as the residence of Perth the chancellor, the Popish minister of a Popish monarch.

As the great national crisis approached, the Papists were insulted as they attended mass at the chapel. The guards interfered to chastise the rioters, and the government, with ill-timed severity, punished a man with death for using words of

encouragement to the multitude. At length, 10th December, 1688, the insurrection assumed an organized and formidable aspect. A great number of the youth of the city assembling with arms in their hands, such as they could procure in haste, marched towards the abbey in something like military array. One Captain Wallace, who commanded about one hundred and forty soldiers on the palace guard, after vainly endeavouring to repel the multitude otherwise, at length fired upon them, killed several, wounded more, and dispersed the whole body. The gentlemen of the Prince of Orange's party appear to have thought this a proper time to declare themselves. A warrant for the surrender of the abbey was obtained from the Convention of Estates, then sitting; the pursuivants, with their habits of ceremony, were called out; the city guard were put under arms, and their old commander, Major Graham, though a notorious persecutor of the Covenanters, was released from prison and placed at their head, on promising to do faithful service at this conjuncture. The Whig gentlemen took arms themselves, with such followers as they could muster. Even Lord Mersington, one of the judges—as drunk, says Lord Balcarres, as ale and brandy could make him—(but that we hope is a scandal,) assumed a halberd upon the occasion. When these motley forces arrived before the abbey, Wallace again refused to yield up the guard intrusted to him; firing commenced on both sides, and discipline was likely once more to have proved superior to zeal and numbers, had not the defenders committed the error of drawing out their men in

front of the building, which afforded Captain Graham an opportunity of forcing his way by a private entrance. Wallace and his soldiers, finding themselves attacked at once in front and rear, dispersed, leaving several slain; and the assailants then forced their way into the palace and chapel, where, unfortunately, not contented with wreaking their displeasure upon the Popish vestments and images which fell into their hands, they laid the chapel utterly waste, tearing down the seats, stalls, and carved ornaments, breaking even into the recesses of the dead; to tear from their coffins the remains of kings and nobles who lay buried in the choir, and leaving the whole a scene of devastation and ruin.

Want of skill and stupidity completed the desolation of this ancient chapel. The Barons of Exchequer, with well-meant attention to its repair, had directed a new roof to be imposed on the ancient walls. But this roof was of freestone, and unhappily its weight proved too great for the frailty of walls, already nearly 600 years old. It fell within two years after it had been put up, breaking down and ruining the ground-work, and the shafts of the columns, and encumbering the whole interior. In this state it still remains.

To increase the disgust occasioned by a spectacle so melancholy, there was formerly a custom of exhibiting to visitors the wretched remains of our former sovereigns, as the thigh-bones of Henry Darnley, (which warranted the traditional accounts of his great height,) the skull of Queen Margaret, the corpse of a certain Countess of Roxburgh, who

had the misfortune to be shrivelled into a mummy, and similar ghastly relics of mortality. This indecent and degrading exhibition is now prohibited, and the bones of the departed built up in their separate tombs. There have been also proposals under the consideration of the Peers of Scotland and other eminent persons, for repairing and re-establishing the royal chapel; and it may be hoped, that the prospect to which Scotland looks forward, of once more receiving a monarch within her metropolis, may hasten so desirable an undertaking.

The Palace of Holyrood itself has been only twice inhabited by princely tenants since it was left by the Duke of York. The adventurous Charles Edward Stuart was resident there for some time before and after the battle of Prestonpans, in the eventful years 1745-6. More lately, and in our own time, these deserted apartments served to accommodate his Royal Highness the Compte d'Artois, younger brother to his Majesty Louis XVIII., with the emigrant nobility who were attached to his person.[1]

It ought to be mentioned, that the precincts of the palace, together with an extensive range

[1] [King George the Fourth held his levees in the Palace of Holyrood in August 1822. In January 1796, the exiled Compte d'Artois, afterwards Charles X. of France, took up his residence in Holyrood, where he remained until August 1799. When again driven from his country, by the Revolution of 1830, the same unfortunate prince, with all the immediate members of his family, sought refuge once more in the ancient palace of the Stuarts, and remained there until 18th September, 1832.]

of hill, rock, and pasture-ground, comprehending Arthur's Seat and Salisbury Crags, and termed the King's Park, have the privileges of a sanctuary to those who are exposed to imprisonment at the suit of civil creditors. There is a separate jurisdiction within this district, exercised by the bailie of the Duke of Hamilton, the heritable keeper of the palace. When debts are contracted within the sanctuary, a rare occurrence, it may be supposed, where credit is necessarily much under the control of caution, the debtor finds a place of restraint, even in this privileged bounds, and is committed to the prison of the sanctuary.

This privilege of sanctuary, like other matters of the kind, has both its advantages and inconveniences. It has often afforded an honest, but unfortunate, individual, time to look into his own affairs, and to provide honourably and fairly for their final extrication. At other times it has been abused by the profligacy of some, and the incurable imprudence of others. It may be remarked, that it is fully more frequently resorted to by our neighbours of England than by native Scotsmen, the mildness of our law respecting personal duresse making it scarce worth the debtor's while to fly to the sanctuary, nor worth that of the creditor to throw him into a prison, from which (if no fraud is alleged against him) he is sure to be liberated after a brief confinement.

The gardens, &c., in the vicinity of the Abbey of Holyrood House, with all the remaining offices, have of course suffered by the negligence which has permitted the building itself to run into disrepair,

and the chapel to fall into ruins. The Botanical Garden was originally established there, but it has been long removed to a more favourable situation. Were the spirit of the haughty Duke of York to revisit the scenes he once inhabited, the apostrophe of Shakspeare, most applicable in all its parts to the present state of this ancient palace, might be addressed to the phantom by those whose disastrous circumstances make them the inmates of the sanctuary:—

> " Alas! and what shall York see here
> But empty lodgings, and unfurnish'd walls,
> Unpeopled offices, untrodden stones,—
> And what cheer find for welcome but our groans?"
>
> *Richard II.*

EDINBURGH, FROM SAINT ANTHONY'S CHAPEL.

[CALLCOTT.]

THE present view is taken from Saint Anthony's Chapel, of which a shattered ruin rises on the shoulder of Arthur's Seat. It belonged to the cell of a hermit, the vestiges of which still remain near to the chapel.

The ruins are crumbling fast to decay, and have already lost a tower, which, in the time of Maitland, still adorned the western end. The site of the hermitage and chapel are chosen with striking propriety; and seem, as becomes the abode of

ascetic devotion, to frown from their rugged and lofty site upon the abode of Scottish monarchy, and the noise and tumult of the capital, placed, as it were, above the vanities of human life, yet having them full in view. The history of the hermitage has not been handed down to us. The chapel has been a plain but handsome Gothic building. A high rock rises behind the cell, from the foot of which gushes a pure and plentiful fountain, dedicated of course to Saint Anthony, the *Genius Loci*. It is mentioned in a beautiful and well-known Scottish song,

> "Now Arthur's Seat sall be my bed,
> The sheets sall ne'er be fyled by me;
> Saint Anton's Well sall be my drink,
> Since my true love's forsaken me."

REGALIA OF SCOTLAND.

[A. GEDDES.]

THE date of the various articles of the regalia can be precisely ascertained, excepting only that of the CROWN, concerning which something is left to conjecture. Neither does this doubt relate to the crown as it at present appears, because it is certain that the arches, ball, and cross, which close and surmount the original coronet or diadem, were added to it by James V.; so that the question only remains, to what era we ought to refer the diadem itself, which is unquestionably of a date more ancient than the additions made to it.

There is a natural inclination in the mind to ascribe the date of so remarkable a relic to a period of national triumph, and its formation to the commands of a victorious and patriotic monarch: we cannot, therefore, wonder at the fond desire which Scottish antiquaries have shown to refer the date of this diadem, in the language of national song, to

"Days when gude KING ROBERT rang."

And although no direct proof can be produced that this was actually the case, the following circumstances seem to render the conjecture highly probable.

There can be no doubt, that, from an early period, the Scottish, like other European nations, used the crown as a symbol of royalty, and accordingly their historians mention on various occasions

the ceremony of coronation at the Abbey of Scone; but the crown used on these occasions, with every other emblem of royalty, was taken from John Baliol by Edward I. of England, in the year 1296. The ceremony of degradation was performed in the Castle of Montrose, (or Brechin, according to other authorities,) where the unfortunate Baliol was produced before Edward, dressed in the full robes, and adorned with all the ensigns of royalty. The garments were stripped from him one by one: the lining of ermine was torn from his royal vest, from which he acquired the ignominious nickname of *Toom-tabart*, or *Empty Coat*—the sceptre, sword, crown, and ring, were then severally taken from him, and the degraded monarch was compelled, by the symbol of delivering a white wand, to yield up to Edward his full right of sovereignty.[1] It cannot be doubted that the English king retained possession of these royal insignia, since he was at the pains to transport to London the celebrated marble stone used at the coronation of the Scottish kings,—an emblem of his victorious usurpation neither so valuable nor so portable.

If farther proof were wanting of the English monarch having carried off or destroyed the regalia of Scotland in the year 1296, it arises out of the fact, that when Bruce first asserted his right to the crown of Scotland, and was crowned king at Scone, a tem-

March 29, 1306.

1 The original account of this mortifying ceremony, as given by the Prior of Lochleven, may be found in the Appendix to this description, No. I.

porary circle, or *coronel* of gold, was used for that purpose, which would have been unnecessary had the ancient Regalia existed, or been within his reach. Even this temporary badge of royalty fell into the hands of the English after Bruce's defeat at the battle of Methven, exactly three months after his coronation. The golden crownlet, after Bruce's defeat and flight, appears for a time to have been concealed by one Geoffrey de Coigners, to whose care it had probably been intrusted. These circumstances we learn from the tenor of a pardon issued by King Edward to Coigners, at the instance of Queen Margaret of England.[1]

June 19, 1306.

It is certain, therefore, that when the victor of Bannockburn assumed the absolute sovereignty of his dominions, there was no Scottish crown in existence, since that used by his predecessors, as well as the coronel made for his own coronation, had both fallen into the hands of the English. Of their subsequent fate we are entirely ignorant; nor does it clearly appear what measures were ever afterwards taken for their restoration to Scotland. It is indeed sufficiently ascertained, that at the Peace of Northampton, in 1328, it was agreed that the famous stone of Scone, on which the kings of Scotland were wont to sit at their coronation, should be restored to the Scots:[2] and it seems

[1] Appendix, No. II.

[2] There is in the possession of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, a writ under the Privy Seal of Edward III., dated at Bordesley, in July, 1328, directed to the abbot and convent of Westminster; in which, after reciting that his council had, in his Parliament holden at Northampton, agreed

difficult to suppose that a similar stipulation had not been made for the restitution of the Scottish regalia; unless, perhaps, they had been destroyed during the interval of the English usurpation.[1] Certain it is, that if any such condition was made, it was not complied with in the case of the regalia, any more than that respecting the stone of Scone, which, notwithstanding the treaty, was still retained in England. The ancient crown of Scotland, therefore, was never restored, which renders it highly probable that the diadem now preserved was made by Bruce's orders, to replace "the golden round and top of sovereignty," which was the visible emblem of the national independence, recovered by the wisdom and valour of the Scottish deliverer.

At the death of Robert Bruce, such a crown was in existence, for his son, David II., held his

that the stone whereupon the Kings of Scotland used to sit at the time of their coronation, and which was then in the keeping of that abbot and convent, should be sent to Scotland, and that he had ordered the Sheriffs of London to receive the same from them by indenture, and cause it to be carried to the Queen Mother; he commands the abbot and convent to deliver up the said stone to those sheriffs as soon as they should come to them for that purpose.—*Calendars of Ancient Charters, &c. Introd.* p. 58.

1 The different parts of what has been denominated the Treaty of Northampton, from the place of its final ratification by Edward III. and his parliament, were contained in various instruments and indentures, dated, some of them at York, others at Edinburgh. Of these, the principal are now known to be preserved in the public archives of Scotland; but in none of them is there any stipulation either respecting the Scottish regalia, or the stone of Scone.—See the new Edition of RYMER's *Fœdera*.

coronation with unusual solemnity; and it is particularly noticed, that, by the special directions of the Pope, the ceremony of unction was then, for the first time, used in the inauguration of a Scottish monarch. Where new ceremonies were added, the ancient rites were doubtless carefully observed; and it cannot be doubted, therefore, that David was regularly crowned, and with a diadem suited to his dignity, which crown must have been fabricated betwixt the date of the battle of Bannockburn in 1314, and that of David II.'s coronation in 1329.

The workmanship of the ancient portion of the present crown, and in particular, the mode in which the gems are set, betoken great antiquity, and appears at least as early as the fourteenth century, which corresponds with the date of Bruce's reign. After this period, precious stones were usually polished and cut into facets, whereas those of the Scottish crown are set rough, and in their natural state, without any attempts to relieve or improve their appearance by the art of the lapidary.

To these observations it may be added, that such representations as exist of the Scottish crown previous to the time of Robert, whether on coins or on the seals of monarchs, are, as far as the rudeness of the delineation enables us to judge, of a different form from that which we are now treating of, and represent a diadem ornamented with *fleurs-de-lis* only, whereas, from the time of Robert Bruce downwards, the *fleurs-de-lis* are interchanged with crosses, as on the present crown. The head of David I. at Melrose Abbey, is in like manner en-

vironed with a crown bearing *fleurs-de-lis* only; whereas that supposed to represent Robert Bruce, in the Abbey of Dunfermline, where that great deliverer lies buried, bears the crosses also. These circumstances afford strong indications in support of the hypothesis which assigns the date of the present crown to the happy reign of that great monarch.

There occurs only one argument affecting this hypothesis; namely, that it is possible the crown used at David's coronation may have been again carried off during the brief usurpation of Edward Baliol in 1332. But although it is certain, that in that year Baliol went through the ceremony of a coronation at Scone, and therefore was in possession of the regalia, yet there is nothing in any of the historians which can lead us to suppose that any dilapidation took place on that occasion. Neither could Baliol, whose ambition it was, under the protection of England, to establish himself as king of Scotland, have had the slightest motive for offering such a gratuitous insult to the feelings of his subjects. To which it may be added, that his expulsion from Scotland was so sudden and so precipitate, that, far from having time to carry with him any part of the national jewels, Baliol escaped from Annan with scarce a single attendant, and very nearly in a state of nakedness. In the long wars and disturbances which followed, Scotland was indeed repeatedly overrun, but never subjugated; Dumbarton, Dunbar, and other strongholds, were usually in possession of the patriots, who had therefore the means of securing the regalia. We

cannot suppose that they neglected this; for the silence both of English and Scottish historians, whose exultation or grief would have been sufficiently clamorous, seems to assure us that the crown of Bruce did not again fall into the hands of the enemy.

We ought also to mention, that, as far as the rudeness of the coinage enables us to determine, the coins of Scotland, down to the reign of James IV., exhibit a diadem or circle, relieved with *fleurs-de-lis* and crosses, exactly resembling the original and more ancient part of the present Scottish crown.

In the end of the fifteenth century, the sovereigns of the independent states of Europe began to alter the shape of their crowns, and to close them with arches at the top, in imitation of those which are called imperial. This distinction was formerly proper to emperors. "The crown of the emperor," we translate from Honorious of Augsburg, "represents the circle of the globe. Augustus, therefore, bears it in evidence that he possesses the sovereignty of the world. An arch is bended over the diadem, in order to represent the ocean, by which the world is divided."[1] But although this mystical explanation seems to render the arched crown peculiar to the imperial dignity, the distinction was soon afterwards assumed by the kings of Europe, in order to establish a suitable distinction between independent monarchs and the petty sovereigns of every description, all of whom assumed the diadem, or open crown. Charles VIII. of

[1] *Gemma Animæ*, lib. i. cap. 224.

France took an arched crown in the year 1495. There is some doubt with regard to the time when the close crown was assumed in England, but the best authorities refer it to the reign of Henry VII. and the year 1485. The practice at length became so general, that the French phrase, *fermer la couronne*, signifies the effort of a prince to shake himself clear of vassalage to a superior

The Scottish monarchs had more reason than most others to maintain in every way their title to that independence, which they had been so often obliged to assert against the encroaching pretensions of their neighbours. Accordingly, on James IV.'s second coinage in the year 1483, he is represented with bushy hair, and a close or arched crown, which, as Snelling remarks, is as early, if not an earlier assumption of this mark of supremacy, as any that appears in the English series.[1]

But although this badge of sovereignty was represented as arched upon the Scottish coinage, as a public intimation of independent sovereignty, it is probable that the actual crown itself underwent no change until the reign of James V., who added the two concentric circles, surmounted at the point of intersection with a mound of gold enamelled, and a large cross *patée*, upon which are the characters J. R. V. We have already stated, that it is evident that these arches are of a date much posterior to the original crown, from the following circumstances:—1st, They have not originally made a part of the diadem, but are attached to it by tacks

[1] *Views of the Silver Coinage of Scotland*, 1774, pp. 10, 11.

of gold. 2dly, The workmanship of the arches is of a different and inferior description. 3dly, The metal differs in quality, the gold of the arches being inferior in purity to that which forms the diadem. When, therefore, we find in the Manuscript Diary of Lord Fountainhall, preserved in the Advocates' Library, a memorandum, stating that "the crown of Scotland is not the ancient one, but was casten of new by King James V.," we must understand it in the limited sense of an alteration of the form by the addition of the arches, not an actual remoulding of the whole substance of the crown.

The SCEPTRE was also made in the reign of James V., as appears by the characters J. R. V. engraved under the figures of the three saints, which are placed upon the top of it. It may be presumed that the sceptre was made at the same time when the crown was altered; most probably during the king's visit to Paris in 1536. James, when preparing for his intimate alliance with France by marrying one of her princesses, might be naturally induced to repair and augment the splendour of the national regalia; and the advanced state of the arts at Paris afforded him the best opportunity of doing so.[1]

[1] The only part of the sceptre which seems of a different age from that of James V. is the large globular mass of rock crystal and its peculiar metallic *settings*, which surmount the sculptured figures near the top, and which indicate a degree of rudeness in the arts that ill accords with the other parts of the workmanship. It seems by no means improbable that this stone (which in the wardrobe inventories is dignified with the name of a *great beryll*) was an amulet which had made part of the more ancient sceptre of the Scottish kings.

The SWORD OF STATE has an earlier date than the sceptre. This beautiful specimen of early art was presented to King James IV. by the warlike Pope Julius II., in the year 1507. It was accompanied by a consecrated hat; and both, as we are made acquainted by Lesly,[1] were delivered with great solemnity in the Church of Holyrood by the Papal Legate and the Abbot of Dunfermline. This article of the regalia is not interesting to the antiquary alone; the beautiful and fanciful style of the sculpture upon the handle, and the filigree work with which the sheath is covered, carry back the admirer of the arts to the period when they revived in their splendour. The various devices which are interwoven with the chasing represent the Papal tiara and the keys of St Peter, — ornaments appropriate to the See of Rome; and the foliage of oak-leaves and acorns, the personal device of Pope Julius, with which they are intermingled, forms a most beautiful example of the style of ornament commonly termed *grotesque*, which is thus described by Benvenuto Cellini.

"In Italy there is a variety of tastes, and we cut foliages in many different forms; the Lombards make the most beautiful wreaths, representing ivy leaves, and others of the same sort, with agreeable twinings highly pleasing to the eye. The Romans and Tuscans have a much better notion in this respect, for they represent acanthus leaves, with all their festoons and flowers, winding in a variety of forms, and amongst these leaves they insert birds

[1] *De Rebus Gestis Scotorum*, edit. 1578. p. 330.

and animals of several sorts, with great ingenuity and elegance in the arrangement. They in part likewise have recourse to wild flowers, such as those called lyon's mouths, accompanied with other fine inventions of imagination, which are termed grotesque by the ignorant."[1]

Having thus given some account of the external appearance of these regalia, and of the date to which each article may be ascribed, it remains to notice the use which was made of them upon public occasions of solemnity, together with such particulars as can be collected respecting their history.

The chief use of these ornaments, unquestionably, was at the CORONATION of each new monarch.

It happens that the Scottish writers, seldom very full in recording matters of mere ceremonial, have left us no particular account respecting the rites of coronation. One remarkable part of the ceremonial, as practised in the early monarchy, seems to have derived its origin from the ancient Celtic ceremony of placing the new chief, or tanist, upon a stone or rock, when assuming for the first time the command of his tribe. Indeed the stone itself, termed in the Gælic LIAFAIL, (the fated grey-stone,) is said to have been originally brought from Ireland by Fergus, and (according to the Book of Howth) was vocal in heathen times, like the pulpit of Mahomet or statue of Memnon, and emitted a sound when the lawful heir of the crown first was placed upon it.[2] The priests, with the art which they so fre-

[1] *Life of Ben. Cellini*, London, 1771, vol. i., p. 110.
[2] Ware's *Antiquities of Ireland*, p. 17.

quently practised, seem to have adopted, and, after their own manner, sanctified this custom; and hence the usage of placing the new-made monarch of Scotland upon the fated stone, which now altered its character without losing its sanctity, and was credulously believed to have been the pillow of the Patriarch Jacob, when he beheld his vision in the field of Bethel. This part of the ceremonial, the only one very peculiar to Scotland, was abolished by the transference of the *fatal stone* to Westminster, it being of course impossible to find any substitute for so venerable a relic. This loss was sustained several years before any part of the present regalia had an existence, and the sight of the Scottish palladium in the Abbey of Westminster, is still an affliction to the eyes of the more zealous Scotsman.

Respecting other parts of the Scottish coronation ceremony, our chief guide must be the account of the ill-omened coronation of Charles II., as it was performed in the church of Scone on the 1st of January, 1651, when he was called to the throne by the Presbyterian interest, less out of a sense of returning loyalty, than from their strong indignation against their late brethren, the English Independents.

Upon that occasion, the King, clad in a prince's robe, walked in procession from the hall of the palace to the church, the spurs, sword of state, sceptre, and crown, being carried before him by the principal nobility. It was remarkable, that upon this occasion the crown was borne by the unhappy Marquis of Argyle, who was put to death

in no very legal manner immediately after the Restoration, using upon the scaffold these remarkable words, " I placed the crown on the King's head, and in reward he brings mine to the block."

Upon entering the church, the King ascended an elevated throne, and listened to a sermon by Mr Robert Douglas, minister of Edinburgh, in which, with more zeal than decency and discretion, the preacher insisted upon the sins of the royal house, not forgetting those of the King himself. King Charles then solemnly swore to the Covenant, which doubtless, in the opinion of many present, was the most substantial and important part of the ceremony. He then took the coronation oath, as contained in the 8th Act of the first Parliament of James VI. This oath was so much altered upon the change of religion, that it no longer resembles the ancient coronation oath of Scotland, which we have reason to believe was far more special in its description of the civil duties of the sovereign to the subject. There exists an unpublished act of a General Council of the Nation in the reign of Robert III., from which the substance of the ancient oath may be collected; and its terms, as adjusted in one of the Parliaments of King James II., may be still more exactly ascertained.[1]

[1] The act here alluded to is that of a Council-General, holden at Perth, January 27, 1398, appointing David Duke of Rothesay to be the King's lieutenant throughout the realm; and, besides a special oath, peculiarly applicable to this delegated office, requiring further, " the said Duc be sworne til fulfyl efter his power all the thyngis that the Kyng in his crownyng wes sworne for til do to haly kyrke ande the pupyl,"—" that is to say, the fredome ande the rycht of the

Charles was then invested with the royal robes by the High Chamberlain, girded with the sword of state, and crowned by the Marquis of Argyle with the royal crown. Each of these actions was accompanied by a suitable exhortation.

When the King was thus adorned with all the ensigns of his high dignity, lyon king-at-arms caused a herald to call the nobility before their sovereign, one by one, according to their rank. Each as he passed before the King knelt down, and, with his hand touching the crown on the King's head, swore these words: "By the Eternal and Almighty God, who liveth and reigneth for ever, I shall support thee to my utmost." This individual homage being rendered, the nobility held up their hands and took a general oath of fidelity.

The earl mareshal and lyon king then went to the four corners of the stage successively, and proclaimed the obligatory oath to be taken by the subjects at large; and the people, holding up their hands, swore: "By the Eternal and Almighty God, who liveth and reigneth for ever, we become your liege-men, and truth and faith shall bear unto

kyrke to kepe wndamyste; the lawys ande the lowable custumes to geer be kepit to the pupil; manslaerys, reiferis, brynneris, ande generaly all mysdoeris thruch styrnthe til restreygnyhe and punyse; and specialy cursit men heretekis and put fra the kyrke, at the request of the kyrke, to restreygne."

The coronation oath, said to have been made in the Parliament of James II., June 14, 1445, is not preserved on record, but may be found in several ancient manuscripts of Scottish law. From one of these manuscripts, preserved in the Harleian Library, it has been printed in Pinkerton's History, vol. i., App.,p. 476.

you, and live and die with you against all manner of folk whatsoever, in your service, according to the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant." The nobility and the lyon king-at-arms then assumed their coronets.

The lord chamberlain next unloosed the sword of state from the King's side, drew it, and delivered it drawn into the King's hand, who gave it to the constable to be borne naked before him.

The Earl of Crawford and Lindsay placed the sceptre in the King's right hand, with a suitable exhortation; and the Marquis of Argyle installed him in the royal throne, saying: "Stand and hold fast from henceforth, the place whereof you are the lawful and righteous heir, by a long and lineal succession of your fathers, which is now delivered unto you by authority of Almighty God." The minister then threw in a long word of exhortation; which finished, a free pardon to all offenders was proclaimed from the four corners of the stage by the lord chancellor and the lyon king-at-arms.

The King then, supported by the chancellor, constable, and mareshal, exhibited himself to the people at the door of the church, who received him with shouts of "God save the King!" The new made Monarch returned into the church and assumed his throne, while the lyon king recited the royal pedigree up to Fergus the First. Then the lyon again called the lords, one by one, to do homage, who, kneeling, and holding their hands betwixt the King's hands, did swear these words: "By the Eternal and Almighty God, who liveth and reigneth for ever, I become your liege-man,

and truth and faith shall bear unto you, and live and die with you, against all manner of folk whatever, in your service, according to the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant."

Another long exhortation, pronounced by the minister, in which again the iniquities of the royal house were not forgotten, showed the ill-timed and intemperate zeal of the Presbyterian party. When this was ended, the King, wearing his royal robes, with the crown on his head, the sceptre in his hand, and the sword of state borne before him, returned to the palace in solemn procession.

Such was the ceremony of Charles II.'s coronation, in which we may presume, that most of the ancient rites, so far as they were known or remembered, were duly observed. The ceremony of anointing the monarch was indeed omitted, either because the ruling powers judged it in itself superstitious, or because they chanced to recollect that it had been introduced into the coronation ritual by a bull of Pope John XXII. Upon the whole, the impertinent zeal of the puritanic clergy, "thrusting the doctor's chair into the crown," marred the dignity of a solemn union betwixt the king and his people, by an over-strained zeal for the Solemn League and Covenant, and by allusions to former disputes, equally rude, impolitic, and mistimed.

During the sittings of the Scottish Parliament, which were usually preceded by a solemn procession of the members, the regalia were borne in state to the hall of the assembly, and, as emblems of the royal authority, were placed on a table before the

throne, when they were not worn upon the person of the sovereign.

It has been already mentioned, that the royal assent to the acts of the Scottish Parliament was given by touching them with the sceptre. According to the ancient and established ceremony in such cases, the lord chancellor presented the laws to the sovereign, or, in his absence, to the commissioner who occupied the throne as the King's representative, and the King, or his commissioner, touched the bills with the sceptre. James VI. was at great pains to explain this matter to the English Parliament when he adjourned them on the last day of March, 1607. His object was to impress upon his English subjects that the royal authority which he possessed, according to the constitution of Scotland, gave him a negative voice in the proceedings of the national council. "Besides," said the British Solomon, "when they (*i. e.* the Scottish Parliament) have passed them for laws, they are presented unto mee, and I, with my sceptre put into my hand by the chancellor, must say, *I ratifie and approve all thingis done in this present Parliament.* And if there bee any thing that I dislike, they rase it out before. If this may be called a negative voyce, then I have one I am sure in that Parliament."

The production of the honours in Parliament was accounted such a necessary part of the solemnity attending the sitting of that national body, that their absence was accounted ominous. When the Articles of Perth, so obnoxious to the presbyterians, were passed in the year 1621, the dis-

contented party exulted that the tempest upon this occasion (in itself a prodigy) prevented the regalia from being brought in procession to the Parliament, and that the hated articles were not greeted with the presence of the honours when they were adopted.

During the sitting of Parliament, the royal insignia were placed under the care and custody of the Earl Mareshal of Scotland, whose high office of state was hereditary in the family of Keith. It would also appear that the same officer claimed a right to preserve the regalia during the intervals in which Parliament was not sitting; but as this must have been attended with much inconvenience, the castles, estates, and vassallage of that great nobleman, by which alone he could protect the regalia, lying far in the north, and at a distance from the seat of government, the honours, excepting upon one memorable occasion, to be hereafter noticed, seem to have been usually lodged, with the rest of the royal treasure, in the jewel-house, under the care of the treasurer for the time. We find them, accordingly, repeatedly given up in the inventories of the royal treasure; as, for example, in the year 1539, when this entry occurs in the inventory of the royal wardrobe:—

"JOWELLIS.

"Item, ane crowne of gold sett with perle and precious stanis.

"Item, in primis diamentis tuenty

"Item, of fyne orient perle thre scoir and aucht, wantand ane floure delice of god.

" Item, ane septour with ane grete bereal and ane perle in the heid of it.

" Item, twa swerdis of honour, with twa beltis, the auld belt wantand foure stuthis."[1]

In a subsequent inventory, given up by John Tennand, 28th November, 1542, a similar entry occurs concerning the regalia.

" Item, in the first his grace's croun, full of precius stanes and orient perle, with ane septur set with ane greit barrell.

" Item, twa swordis of honour, with twa beltis wantand four stuthis.

" Item, ane rob royall of purpour velvatt lynitt with armin, and ane kirtill of the samyne velvott, lynitt in the foir breistis with armyn and heid siclyk."

In these inventories the reader will see mention made of *two* swords of state; the second was probably that which was presented to James V. from the Papal See, upon the 22d February, 1536; a gift which, according to Lesly, was accompanied by an intimation which James, for the time, had the wisdom to disregard, that the edge of the weapon would be well employed against his heretical neighbour, Henry VIII. of England. This sword appears to have been lost in the lapse of time; or in the dilapidation of the royal treasure

[1] *Collection of Inventories and other Records of the Royal Wardrobe and Jewel-House, &c.* Edin. 1815, 4to.

which took place during the beginning and latter end of Queen Mary's reign.

Another curious article occurs in Tennand's inventory, namely, "the Queenis Graces crown, set haill with the perle and precious stanis, with ane sceptour with ane quhyte hand." These subordinate articles of the regalia have been also long lost or destroyed.

At the accession of James VI. to the crown of England, it is probable he carried with him to his new kingdom all the personal part of the royal treasure; but the honours, properly so called, remained in Scotland, and continued to be kept by the treasurer during the period when the Parliament was not sitting. Upon the death of Sir Gideon Murray of Elibank, treasurer depute of Scotland, his son, Sir Patrick Murray, presented a supplication to the Privy Council, setting forth that it had pleased the King's Majesty to commit to his deceased father, the keeping of his Majesty's honours, to wit, his Majesty's crown, sceptre, and sword, with his Majesty's whole silver plate of the kingdom of Scotland, and the mace, called the treasurer's mace, of the said kingdom, from the charge of which valuable articles the said Sir Patrick Murray prayed to be relieved. The lords of the Privy Council ordered the honours, with the great oak chest in which they were usually kept, to be delivered up to the Earl of Mar, then lord high treasurer. At a meeting of the Privy Council, five days afterwards, the lords pronounced an order discharging Sir Patrick Murray of the custody of the regalia, as having been, after exact

inspection, delivered in their lordships' presence to the Earl of Mar. The original proceedings, which may be seen in the Appendix, No. III., contain an accurate description of the crown and its jewels, real and counterfeited, mentioning also, that ten of the small *challoms*, or spaces, were filled with blue enamel instead of stones; that there were two *challoms* totally empty, and two filled with flat white stones; all which imperfections exist at the present day. The same accurate description takes notice, that the top of the sceptre has been broken and pieced; and also that the handle and scabbard of the sword of state had sustained some damage; which injuries may be still observed.

There is a constant tradition, for which we are not able to produce a distinct or written authority, that Charles I. desired to have the crown of Scotland sent up to London to be used in his coronation there; but that this having been declined by the Scottish Privy Council, as contrary to the laws of the kingdom, he was induced to undertake a journey to Scotland, in order to be there crowned king. Upon this occasion Clarendon informs us, that the king appeared with no less lustre at Edinburgh than at Whitehall; and that the pomp of his coronation passed with all the solemnity and evidence of public joy which could be expected or imagined,—a glimpse of sunshine soon to be overcast by the approaching tempest. Nor did it escape that great historian, that the lavish expense of the Scottish nobility, emulous to support their dignity upon such an occasion, involved their estates in debt, which

June 8, 1632.

finally rendered them discontented, and ripe for desperate councils.

In the beginning of the Scottish civil wars in 1637, while the Marquis of Hamilton was residing at Dalkeith, he appears to have meditated the removal of the regalia, not perhaps conceiving them very safe in the hands of the Earl of Mar, then governor of Edinburgh Castle. But as no defence was ultimately made, the royal insignia fell into the hands of the Covenanters in 1638, as appears from the following passage in Baillie's Letters :— " Dalkeith, in the treasurer's sight, was taken, with the munition that so much din was of, seized on. The crown, sceptre, and sword, which (I know not how) had been transported there, were, with all reverence, brought back by our nobles to their proper place in the Castle of Edinburgh."[1]

In the year 1650, Charles II., recalled from abroad by the Presbyterian party in Scotland, was crowned at Scone, and we have already noticed the ceremonies which were observed upon that occasion. The subsequent national misfortunes, and the defeat at Worcester, laid Scotland open to the invading army. The regalia had hitherto, according to ancient usage, been regularly delivered to the earl mareshal, to be by him kept during the sitting of Parliament, and again redelivered to the commissioners of the treasury upon the rising or adjournment of that assembly, and instruments were asked and taken upon all these occasions, in evidence that the officers on either

1 Baillie's Letters, &c vol. i., p. 158.

side had discharged their duty, and acquitted themselves faithfully of the responsibility annexed to it. Several examples of this formality may be seen in the Appendix, No. IV. But the time now approached rapidly when it became highly desirable to find a more remote and secure place, in which to deposit these national treasures, than any which remained in the power of the lords of the treasury. Edinburgh Castle, and all the strongholds south of the Forth, were already in the hands of the English, so that on the 6th day of June, 1651, being the last day on which the Scottish Parliament sat, they ordered the earl mareshal to transport the regalia to his Castle of Dunnotter, to be kept there until further orders.

Dunnotter Castle, the ancient baronial castle of the mareshal family, is situated near Stonehaven, in Forfarshire, upon a perpendicular rock, the top of which forms a space of several acres, walled around the verge of the precipice, and covered with buildings. The rock projects into the German Ocean on the one side; and on the other is separated from the mainland by a chasm of tremendous depth, only accessible by one very steep and narrow path, leading to the castle gate, which opens into a long and intricate covered way.

The strength of Dunnotter is, however, greater in appearance than reality; for though impregnable before the use of artillery, the castle is now commanded from several of the neighbouring heights.

The defence of this place was intrusted to George Ogilvy of Barras, a soldier of experience,

trained in the wars in Germany, to whom the earl mareshal, with the title of lieutenant-governor, committed the full command of the castle and the garrison, and whose appointment as such appears to have been directly sanctioned by the King. The garrison amounted only to about one hundred men, a number quite insufficient to man the walls of a castle so extensive; but it was probably thought that the natural strength of the place secured it against every mode of attack but surprise or regular approaches.

The only remaining authority then existing in Scotland, opposed to the English, was that of a Committee of Estates appointed by the King and Parliament in June 1651; and so limited had their means become in consequence of the rapid advances of the English army, that the supplies of ammunition and provisions to the Castle of Dunnotter appear to have depended almost entirely on the private exertions of the lieutenant-governor,[1]

1 There is a local tradition, that along with some other artillery sent to Dunnotter Castle, was the celebrated piece of ancient ordnance familiarly known by the name of Mons Meg. The bed *she* is believed to have occupied during the siege is still shown upon a battery projecting over the sea, of a size far exceeding that of the other embrasures, and from which *she* still gets the credit of having dismasted an English vessel steering for the harbour of Stonehaven, at the distance of a mile and a half. These traditions, however agreeable to our national prejudices, and in harmony with the popular respect which Mons appears always to have commanded, are unhappily falsified by the official documents respecting the surrender of the Castle of Edinburgh in December 1650, published by order of the Parliament of England. Among these is a list of the ordnance taken in the castle on the 24th December, 1650; in which a conspicuous place is given to "the great

whose resources were drawn chiefly from the neighbouring estates of the earl mareshal, him-

iron murderer called Muckle Megg." In another list, *she* is denominated "the Great Mag."

Having been thus compelled to deprive "*Muckle Meg*" of a part of her traditionary honours, we shall beg leave to make *l'amende honorable* to this redoubted *female*, by here recording some of the genuine evidence of that special consideration in which she was held at a still earlier period of her history. In the accounts of the high treasurer during the reign of James IV. the following entries are to be found, relative chiefly to *her* transportation from Edinburgh Castle to the Abbey of Holyrood, apparently on some occasion of national festivity.

"Item, to the pyonouris to gang to the castell to help with *Mons* doun . . . . . x s.

"Item, to the menstrallis that playit befoir *Mons* doun the gait . . . . . xiv s.

"Item, giffin for xiii stane of irne to mak grath to *Mons* new cradill, and gavillokkis to ga with hir for ilk stane xxviii d . . . . . xxx s. iv d.

"Item, to vii wrichtis for ii dayis and ane half, that maid *Mons* cradill, to ilk man on the day . . . . xvi d.

"Item, for walking of *Mons* the xxv, xxvi, xxvii, xxviii, xxix dayis of Julij, and the gunnis in the Abbay ilk nicht iii s.

"Item, the last day of August giffyn to Robyn Ker, to fee 100 warkmen to pas with *Mons*, sic like as the laif war feit to ilk man vi s. . . . . xxx li.

"Item, for xxiv lib. of talloun for *Mons*.

"Item, for ½ galloun of tar . . . . . ii s.

"Item, viii elle of canvas to be *Mons* a claith to cover hir . . . . . ix s. iiii d.

"Item, for mair talloun to *Mons* . . . . ii s.

"Item, giffin to John Mawar and ii wrychtis to pas with *Mons* for thair oukis wage . . . . . xxx s.

"Item, for ii smythis to pas with hir, for ane oukis wage to ilk ane of thame . . . . . ix s. iiii d.

"Item, 200 spikin nalis to turse with *Mons* . . iii. s.

"Item, to the lede-man makand ledin pellokkis.

"Item, for iiii grete towis to *Mons* weyand xvi stane.

"Item, to bear thame to the Abbay to *Mons*."

In the festivities celebrated at Edinburgh by the Queen-

self by this time a prisoner in the Tower of London.

The regalia had not been long lodged in the fortress of Dunnotter, before the hazard of their falling into the hands of the enemy appeared so imminent, that the Committee of Estates, now returned to Aberdeen, applied to Lieutenant-Governor Ogilvy by letter, directing the honours to be removed from that castle. Upon a further retreat to the western end of Loch Tay, the Committee resumed the subject, and addressed an order to the Earl of Balcarras, authorizing him to receive the regalia from Lieutenant-Governor Ogilvy, whom they directed to deliver them up to his lordship. The lieutenant-governor declined to comply with either of these requisitions, not considering Balcarras as properly authorized to relieve him from the responsibility which had been imposed on him by the ordinance of Parliament. In a personal interview with Lord Balcarras, he renewed this refusal, and expressed his reasons in a letter to the Earl of Loudoun, the lord chancellor, declaring his readiness to surrender the regalia, upon being discharged from his responsibility; or his willingness

Aug. 31. 1651.

Dowager, Mary of Guise, on the occasion of her daughter's marriage to the Dauphin of France in 1558, Mons Meg was, of course, not allowed to remain silent or inactive. In the treasurer's accounts there is the following article:—

"By the Queenis precept and speciale command, Item the third day of Julii [1558] to certane pyonaris for thair lauboris in the mounting of *Mons* furth of hir lair to be schote, and for the finding and carying of hir bullet after scho wes schot fra Weirdie Mure to the Castell of Edinburgh," &c.

to defend his charge to the last in the Castle of Dunnotter, if he were supplied with men, provisions, and ammunition, of the want of all which he complained heavily. The Earl of Loudoun returned an answer, which we quote, in order to show the desperate circumstances in which Lieutenant-Governor Ogilvy was supposed to be placed by those best qualified to judge of his situation, as well as the deep personal responsibility at which he undertook to defend the honours of Scotland—a task from which he had so fair an opportunity of escaping, had he been disposed to shelter himself under the opinion of others.

"I conceive," says the chancellor in his letter, "that the trust committed to you, and the safe custody of the things under your charge, did require that victual, a competent number of honest and stout soldiers, and all other necessaries, should have been provided and put in the castle before you had been in any hazard; and if you be in good condition, or that you can timely supply yourself with all necessaries, and the place be tenable against all attempts of the enemie, I doubt not but you will hold out. But if you want provisions, sogers, and ammunition, and cannot hold out at the assaultis of the enemie, which is feared and thought you cannot doe; if you be hardlye persewed, I know no better expedient than that the honours of the crowne be speedilye and saiflie transported to some remote and strong castle or hold in the Highlands; and I wish you had delivered them to the Lord Ballcarras, as was desired by the Committee of Estates; nor doe I know any better way for

preservatione of the thingis, and your exoneration; and it will be an inexpressable lose and shame if these thingis shall be taken by the enemie, and very dishonourable for yourself. So having granted you the best advice I can at present, I trust you will with all care and faithfulness be answerable, according to the trust committed to you."

The country being now overrun by the English, the Castle of Dunnotter was summoned to surrender, with promise of fair terms, by Lieutenant-General Overtoun; and shortly afterward the governor received a similar summons from Lieutenant-Colonel Dutton, warning him of the inutility of resistance when almost all the other national fortresses had surrendered. To both these summonses Ogilvy returned a determined answer, expressing his resolution to defend the castle to the last. Nov. 8. Nov. 22.

But in a letter to the King, the lieutenant-governor gives the following melancholy statement of his condition, and, as is usual in a time of general disaster, not without imputing some blame to his companions in misfortune. Dec. 20 1651. "Whereas your Majesty committed the rule of this kingdom to those noblemen who are now in the enemie's hand, among whom is lord mareshal, who, if he had been at liberty, would have done for this place; and those who remained in this kingdom (as Huntly, Balcarras, and others), from whom some help was expected, have laid down their arms and submitted themselves to the enemie; and those forts which might have been

preserved for your Majesty's service are given up to them, Dumbarton and this of Dunnotter only excepted, which is more looked upon by the enemy than any place of the kingdom, the honours of this kingdom, that which is preserved of your Majesty's stuffs, and other things of concernment being here; which, although some noblemen (who now have submitted themselves) have required from me, yet I have retained them, being persuaded that they could not be so safe in any other place of this kingdom, if those noblemen had done their duty, and the event declaring that they should have been in the same condition with themselves. Your Majesty will be pleased to take this to your consideration, and see how this place (which, by the Lord's assistance, shall not be delivered into their hands by my default) may be provided with ammunition and other necessars; for I have received nothing from the publick, (as your Majesty ordained,) but have maintained the same upon the small rent my lord mareshal hath in this place; and now am so invironed with the enemy on all hands, that none will come in hither with provisions, only the sea patent if I had friends. Wherefore your Majesty will be pleased timeously to send your royal commandments hither (if it be possible) with a sure hand, in a small vessel, which may come to the foot of the house (although the enemy were in leaguer about it) and deliver the same without any danger. Your Majesty will be pleased also to look upon an account of my fidelity in relation to the enemie, although they have spread papers to the contrary,

which maketh many to have sinistrous opinions of me; but, by the Lord's help, your Majesty shall find me faithful, do what they please, until I either hear from your Majesty, or see you in such condition as those rebels may be forced to submit themselves, which shall ever be the earnest desire and hearty prayer of your Majesty's most loyal and faithful subject—George Ogilvy."

The plan proposed for sending off the regalia by sea was either not adopted, or proved unsuccessful. Meantime the danger darkened on every hand; the whole kingdom was subdued by the English, excepting the remote glens, where Glengarry, Lochiel, and other Highland chiefs, maintained a desultory resistance, more honourable to themselves than useful to the royal cause. Yet, in defiance of the murmurs of his little garrison, whose numbers were totally insufficient for the defence of so large a fortress, in spite also of every deficiency of provisions and ammunition, and of constant attacks from the enemy, the gallant Ogilvy continued to hold out the castle of Dunnotter. His only encouragement seems to have been a letter from the King, written on a small piece of paper for the purpose of concealment, and sent by a special messenger, who succeeded in delivering it. It is addressed, "For the Governor and Gentlemen in the Castle of Dunnotter," and is of the following tenor:—"Gentlemen, assure yourselves I am very carefull of you, and sensible of your affection to me Give credit to what this bearer shall say to you, and observe the directions you shall receive from Lieutenant-General Middleton. You shall shortly

heare againe from me; and I would have you find some way frequently to advertize me of your condition, which I will take all possible care to relieve

"CHARLES R.

"*Paris, March 26th*, 1652."

General Middleton wrote by the same conveyance, in terms highly flattering to the lieutenant-governor; he uses these strong expressions. "My dear friend—I am overjoyed to hear that you in this time doe behave yourselfe so gallantlie, that I shall be most desirous to doe you a service. The particulars I remit to the bearer, my cozen and yours, to whom give trust, since he is particularlie instructed from him who shall rather perish than be wanting to his friend, and who in all conditions is and shall be yours, J. M."

Notwithstanding the encouragement contained in these letters, it was too plain that the castle could not long hold out. Since the beginning of May it had been closely blockaded, battered from the heights, and harassed by frequent assaults, and the garrison was exhausted with fatigue and by privations. The governor's anxiety about the safety of the regalia rose to the highest pitch. If they fell into the hands of the English, they probably would be destroyed like objects of ordinary plunder,—unless, like the fated stone, they had been carried to London, as trophies of Scotland's disgrace, or that Colonel Overtoun, a fanatical expectant of the fifth monarchy, had thought proper to reserve them to grace the second advent.

In this emergency female ingenuity and courage found a resource. The earl mareshal was a prisoner in England, but his mother, the countess dowager, by birth Lady Margaret Erskine, a daughter of the Earl of Mar, a woman of masculine courage and prudence, was not disposed to forget that the charge of the regalia was one of the honourable duties imposed upon her son as his birth-right inheritance. This lady, in concert with the governor's wife, and with Christian Fletcher, wife of the Rev. James Granger, minister of Kinneff, contrived a daring scheme for extricating the honours of Scotland out of their present precarious situation. In prosecution of their plan, Mrs Granger went to the Castle of Dunnotter, having obtained permission from the English general to visit the governor's lady. In her charge Mrs Ogilvy placed the regalia. This was done without the lieutenant-governor's knowledge, in order that when obliged to surrender the castle, he might with truth declare he knew nothing of the time and manner of their removal. They were delivered by Mrs Ogilvy to her intrepid confidante, who concealed the crown in her lap, while the sceptre and sword, wrapt up in *hards*, or bundles of flax, were placed upon the back of a female domestic. Mrs Granger's horse had been left in the English camp; for so precipitous is the chasm which divides Dunnotter from the mainland, that the castle gate can neither be approached nor entered by a person on horseback. She returned through the English camp unsuspected, the load of her attendant passing for a quantity of flax, which Mrs Ogilvy, according to

the economy of Scottish matrons, destined for the spinning-wheel and loom, and had taken this opportunity to send thither to be manufactured. The English general himself is said courteously to have placed Mrs Granger in her saddle, little dreaming, of course, of the treasure which she had concealed about her person, and alarming her much from the hazard of discovery. She kept her composure, however, and so preserved her secret.

The regalia were thus transported in safety to the manse of Kinneff, and there placed under the charge of the Rev. James Granger, husband of the dauntless matron who had brought them from Dunnotter at so much personal risk. They are said to have been concealed for a time in a double-bottomed bed, until Mr Granger had a safe opportunity of interring them in the church. Meantime Mr Granger granted to the countess of mareshal the following authentic account of their secret depositation. "I, Mr James Granger, minister at Kinneff, grant me to have in my custody the honours of the kingdom, viz. the crown, sceptre, and sword. For the crown and sceptre I raised the pavement-stone just before the pulpit, in the night tyme, and digged under it ane hole, and put them in there, and filled up the hole, and layed down the stone just as it was before, and removed the mould that remained, that none would have discerned the stone to have been raised at all. The sword again, at the west end of the church, amongst some common saits that stand there, I digged down in the ground betwixt the two foremost of these saits, and laid it

March 31, 1652.

down within the case of it, and covered it up, as that removing the superfluous mould, it could not be discerned by any body; and if it shall please God to call me by death before they be called for, your ladyship will find them in that place."

Dunnotter Castle continued to hold out for some time after the removal of the regalia. Whitelock, in his Memorials, notices the preparations for reducing it; and again, twenty days afterwards, he mentions the progress of the siege, and the high terms demanded by the governor. Shortly afterwards, he records its surrender in the following terms:—"That the English forces before *Dunnotter* Castle in *Scotland*, playing with their guns at it, and having shot in about twelve granadoes, which broke into their tower and killed seven men; those in the castle, notwithstanding their high terms before, yielded upon conditions, only to march out half a mile with their arms, and then lay them down. That this was the last garrison in *Scotland* reduced."[1]

May 10, 1652.

May 31.

June 4.

Besides having every motive which could vindicate a man of honour in the surrender of a fortified place, Lieutenant-Governor Ogilvy received a warrant from the earl mareshal, the proprietor of the castle, stating, that he had resolved "to submit his person, fortune, house, and property, into the hands of the existing government, that he might peaceably enjoy himself and what belonged to him under protection of the Commonwealth of

[1] Whitelock's *Memorials of English Affairs in the Year* 1652, p. 510.

England; and in order thereto, as conducing to his good," his lordship required "his assured friend the governor to deliver up his house of Dunnotter to Major-General Deane, who was to receive the same from him in name of his Excellencie, the Lord General Cromwell, for the use of the Commonwealth of England, wherein he must not fail, and for doing which this should be his warrant."

Notwithstanding the injunctions of the lord of the castle, and the straits to which the fortress was reduced, the governor continued to hold out until General Deane granted him terms so advantageous, that they seem to have been dictated by the general's anxiety to possess himself of the regalia. One of the leading articles of the capitulation stipulated, "That the crown and sceptre of Scotland, together with all other ensigns of regalia, should be delivered to the English general, or a good account given thereof, for the use of the Parliament." It was further agreed, "That upon the true performance of the forementioned articles, Captain George Ogilvy, with the officers and soldiers under his command, should have liberty to march forth of the said castle with the usual honours of war," and "to have passes to go to their own homes, and there to live without molestation, &c.; and that the said captain should, free from sequestration, enjoy all the personal estate which he had within the castle of Dunnotter."

On these honourable conditions the last Scottish fortress surrendered to the enemy; but the disappointment of General Deane was extreme, upon

finding that the regalia had been removed, and to what place could by no means be discovered. Letters were received by the English government, stating " that great riches were in Dunnotter Castle, the sword, sceptre, and crown, but they could not be found."[1] The republican general wreaked his disappointment upon Governor Ogilvy, whom he held to have violated the meaning of the capitulation. Heavy fines and rigorous imprisonment were resorted to, to extort from Ogilvy and his lady the secret committed to their charge ; but they remained determined to conceal from the public enemy all information on the subject. The health of Mrs Ogilvy sunk under close confinement, but her courage did not give way ; and in the spirit of the house of Douglas, to which she belonged, she exhorted her husband with her dying breath to preserve inviolable the secret intrusted to him.

The worthy clergyman and his wife did not escape suspicion and strict examination. The tradition even bears, probably with exaggeration, that Mrs Granger, whose visit to the castle was now remembered, was actually put to the torture. They retained their faith with the same firmness as Mrs Ogilvy and her husband, nor could any thing be extorted from them concerning the fate of the treasure under their charge.

In the meanwhile the inventive genius of the countess of mareshal had devised a scheme for diverting the suspicions of the enemy into a false channel. Her younger son, the Honourable Sir

[1] Whitelock's *Memorials*, p. 510

John Keith, had gone abroad about the time that the regalia were removed; and a report was circulated by his mother, that he had carried the regalia with him beyond seas. To sustain this rumour, the young gentleman wrote home to Scotland, claiming the congratulations of his friends on the safety of these honours of the crown; and shortly after, returning from abroad, and being imprisoned and examined, he took on himself the guilt of having carried the crown, sceptre, and sword, abroad, and delivered them to Charles II. at Paris.[1] This well-contrived story deceived the English rulers, and farther search after the Scottish regalia was relinquished.

While they were thus the objects of search, the honours of Scotland remained safe in their place of concealment at Kinneff, undisturbed save by the pious care of the clergyman, who occasionally visited them at night, and with the utmost secrecy, in order to change the cloths in which they were wrapt, and secure them, as far as possible, from the risk of injury by damp or otherwise.

Upon the Restoration, the countess of mareshal and Lieutenant Ogilvy hastened to anticipate each other in communicating the important secret to Charles II., and appear to have entered into an acrimonious controversy, which it is unnecessary to revive, upon the degree of merit which each might claim in the course of the transaction.

Charles II. seems to have distributed his rewards with more regard to rank and influence

[1] Wood's edition of *Douglas's Peerage*, article Earl of Kintore.

than to justice. The Honourable Sir John Keith, in virtue of his mother's merits and his own, was created Earl of Kintore and Knight Mareshal of Scotland, with a salary of four hundred pounds yearly. The office was made hereditary in his family, but was taken from the second Earl of Kintore on account of his accession to the insurrection of 1715. It has been recently bestowed upon Sir Alexander Keith, of Dunnotter, and Ravelston, descended from, and claiming the representation of, the ancient earls mareshal. The Earl of Kintore, also, obtained a coat of augmentation, to be quartered with the arms of Keith, being gules, a sceptre and sword in saltire, with an imperial crown in chief, within an orle of eight thistles, Or, with the motto, *Quæ amissa salva.*

The rewards of the gallant lieutenant-governor of Dunnotter were purely honorary, although his patrimonial estate, never a large one, had been impoverished by the fines and sequestration imposed during the usurpation. He was created a baronet by a diploma, which bears the following testimony to his faithful services :—*Sciatis quandoquidem nos considerantes preclara servitia a dilecto et fideli nostro Georgio Ogilvie de Barras nobis prestita et peracta, (utpote qui auxiliarius fuit in conservatione nostre regie corone, sceptri, et gladii, antiquorum insignium et monumentorum hujus regni nostri,) ac gravia detrimenta que hanc ob causam diu pertulit et subiit ; ac satis compertum habentes ejus constantem fidelitatem et amorem erga nostrum servitium ; eum que toto tempore non ita pridem usurpate dominationis spretis omnibus*

illecebris et minis quibus tunc temporis obnoxius fuit tam candide et ingenue semetipsum gessisse, ut merito symbolum Regii nostri favoris et respectus in eum ejusque familiam in perpetuum conferendum et collocandum censeamus.

The feudal tenure of Sir George Ogilvy's estate of Barras was at the same time changed from ward-holding to that of blanch. In justice to that gallant man, we cannot but record this second acknowledgment of his merit by public instrument, more especially as these empty honours, with an augmented blazon of arms,[1] were the only rewards which he received for his many sufferings and distinguished services.

The new charter states, that it is granted in respect of Sir George Ogilvy's high services, " In that he wes instrumentall in the preservatione of his highness crown, sceptre, and sword, the ancient honours of this his kingdome of Scotland, and the damadge sustained be the same Sir George Ogilvy theirthrow from the beginning of the usurpation, during which tyme, notwithstanding of all temptationes and threatenings used against him by the usurperis, he carryed himself with so much integ-

[1] Viz.—" The said Worshipful Sir George Ogilvie of Barras, Knight Baronet, for his atchievement and ensign armoriall, bears *Argent* a lyon passant guardant, holding betwixt his pawes a sword crested in pale, *Gules*, and therewith defending a thistle placed in the dexter chiefe *vert*, crowned, or with the badge of Nova Scotia as being Baronet. Above the shield an helmit befitting his degree, mantled, *Gules* double *Argent*. Next is placed on ane forse for the crest, a demi-man issuing out of a forse armed at all points proper. The motto in ane escroll, Præclarum Regi et Regno servitium."

rity that his Majestie wes graciously pleased to conceave he deserved ane marke of his Highness favour putt upon him and his family, upon which considerationes his Majestie did, by the foresaid charter, change the holding of his lands of Barras, and of new gave, granted, and disponed to the said Sir George Ogilvy and his foresaids for evir, all and hail the said lands of Wester Barras, with all and sundry the pertinents thairof mentioned in the said chartour, to be halden of his Majestie and his Highnes successores in free blanch ferme for yearlie payment of ane penny," &c.

We ought to mention, that the belt belonging to the sword of state was not delivered up to Mrs Granger, but continued in the possession of Governor Ogilvy, who perhaps retained it as a piece of real evidence of his having had the honours in his custody. It was long afterwards discovered carefully packed up and concealed in the wall of the house of Barras. The belt was easily recognised, being adorned with the same fanciful ciphers and emblems, executed in silver gilt, which appear on the scabbard of the sword. An accurate drawing was taken from the original, in possession of the present Sir George Ogilvy, and it is disposed as a festoon around the regalia on the engraved titlepage and covers of this work.[1]

While rewards and titles were distributed to those of family and interest concerned in this great piece of national service, we are happy to find room to correct a traditional statement, which has found its way into the statistical account of the parish of

[1] [The *Provincial Antiquities*, 2 vols. 4to.]

Kinneff, that the services of the trusty clergyman and his intrepid wife were passed over without notice or reward. On the contrary, an early act of the Scottish Parliament,[1] after the Restoration, endowed Christian Fletcher, otherwise Granger, with the sum of 2000 merks Scottish, as a reward of her courageous loyalty,—a sum considerable in those times, though no doubt this high-spirited woman thought herself best remunerated by the successful discharge of her duty to her country, in saving the emblems of its dignity from the irritated grasp of an invading enemy.

From the Restoration to the period of the Union, the regalia of Scotland continued as formerly to be kept in the crown-room of the castle, under the charge of the treasurer or his deputy, during the intervals of the sessions of Parliament. At the beginning of each session they were delivered to the earl mareshal or his deputy, in whose custody they remained while Parliament continued sitting, and were then again formally restored to the charge of the treasurer. The reader will find in the Appendix, No. VI., a few extracts from the records, describing the manner of this transference.

At the period of the Union, every reader must remember the strong agitation which pervaded the minds of the Scottish nation, who could not, for many years, be persuaded to consider this incorporating treaty in any other view than as a wanton surrender of their national independence. So deep was this sentiment, that a popular preacher in the

[1] See Appendix, No. V.

south of Scotland, who died about the middle of the last century, confessed to his friends, that he was never able to deliver a sermon, upon whatever subject, without introducing a hit at the Union.

While the public mind was in such an inflammatory state, and watching as it were for subjects of offence and suspicion, the fate of the regalia, the visible mark and type of Scotland's independence, excited deep interest. The opposers of the Union, availing themselves of this feeling, industriously circulated a report that the honours of the kingdom were to be transported to England, as a token of the complete humiliation of her ancient rival. This surmise was circulated in lampoons too coarse for quotation, and it served to animate one of Lord Belhaven's eloquent invectives against the projected Union. "Hannibal," he exclaimed, calling on the Scottish nobles and commons to unite against the public danger,—"Hannibal is come within our gates: Hannibal is come within the length of this table; he is at the foot of the throne. He will seize upon these regalia, he will take them as his *spolia opima*. He will whip us out of this house, never to return again."

As if to show that these apprehensions were not entertained without grounds, and that the surreptitious removal of the regalia was an evil to be guarded against, it was moved by the opposers of the Union, when the twenty-fourth article of the treaty was under discussion, "That the crown, sceptre, and sword of state, records of Parliament, &c. continue to be kept as they are within that part of the United Kingdom

Jan. 14, 1707.

now called Scotland; and that they shall so remain in all times coming, notwithstanding the Union." The amendment was readily adopted by the framers and managers of the treaty, sufficiently willing, in their turn, to show that they meditated no such gratuitous insult upon their country as was imputed to them. The clause passed unanimously, and forms part of the great national treaty.

The sceptre of Scotland performed its last grand legislative office, by ratifying the treaty of Union, on the 16th of January, 1707. The Earl of Seafield, then chancellor, on returning it to the clerk, is reported to have brutally and scornfully applied the vulgar phrase, "*There is an end of an auld sang;*"—an insult for which he deserved to have been destroyed on the spot by his indignant countrymen. The rest of the session was employed chiefly in passing private bills; on the 25th of March it was adjourned,—never to meet again; —and on the 28th of April, 1707, the Parliament of Scotland was finally dissolved by proclamation.

From this period the charge of the regalia, which devolved on the earl mareshal during the sessions of the Scottish Parliament, terminated for ever; and in surrendering them, for the last time, to the Earl of Glasgow, treasurer-depute of Scotland, William, the ninth earl mareshal, displayed a feeling extremely different from that evinced by Lord Seafield. That noble person having opposed the Union in all its stages, declined witnessing in person the final consummation, by the surrender of

the regalia to dust and oblivion. He appeared, however, by his procurator, William Wilson, one of the depute-clerks of Session, who took a long protest, which has been often printed, describing the regalia in terms which lead to an exaggerated idea of their value; protesting that they should not be removed from the Castle of Edinburgh, without warning given to him, or to the successor in his title and office.[1]

A numerous body of respectable witnesses placed their names to this instrument. One copy was deposited in the chest, and many others were distributed by the earl mareshal to the universities and other public bodies throughout the kingdom.

The regalia of Scotland, with the treasurer's mace, were deposited in the great oak chest with three keys, which is often mentioned in the Records as a place wherein they were kept. The chest was left in the crown-room of Edinburgh Castle, a vaulted apartment in the square, having the window defended by strong iron gratings, and the entrance secured by a strong grated door of iron, and an outward door of oak, thick studded with iron nails, both fastened with strong locks and bars. It does not appear to whom the keys of the crown-room and chest were intrusted, nor have they ever since been found.

The government of the day were, no doubt, glad to have these objects removed from the sight of the Scottish public, connected as they now were

[1] See the original in Nisbet's *Heraldry*, or in the *Collection of Inventories and Records of the Royal Wardrobe*, &c. printed at Edinburgh, 1815.

with feelings irritable and hostile in a high degree to the Union and to the existing state of things. But when the people observed that the regalia were no longer made visible to the subjects, they fell into the error of concluding that they were either no longer in existence, or had been secretly transferred to England. The gratuitous absurdity of so useless a breach of the Union was, in the opinion of many, no reason for disbelieving this injurious surmise. They said such insults were often committed in the mere wantonness of power, or from the desire to mortify a proud people. Mons Meg, it was remarked, though regarded then as a national palladium, and though totally useless except as a curiosity, had been removed to the Tower of London, in the pragmatical wantonness of official authority, and to the great scandal of the Scottish populace. It was argued, that a similar senseless exertion of power might have removed the regalia, or that they might have been withdrawn on mere political grounds, lest they should have fallen into the hands of the Jacobites, who more than once threatened to surprise Edinburgh Castle. These suspicions were strengthened by the recollection, that, from some circumstance which has never been explained, a crown has been always shown in the Jewel Office of the Tower, said to be that of Scotland. Whether the royal ornament be the crown of the Scottish Queen, mentioned in Tennand's Inventory, which may have been carried by James VI. to England, or whether it be the crown made for Mary of Modena, consort of James II., or some other diadem, is a question we have

no means of deciding. That it is not the royal crown of Scotland, is now evident. But it was long suspected to be so; and even Arnot, the historian of Edinburgh, influenced perhaps by certain political prejudices, gives currency to the surmise that the regalia had been secretly removed from the kingdom. "Since the regalia," says that author, "were deposited, no governor of the castle, upon his admission, has made enquiry if they were left secure by his predecessor. No mortal has been known to have seen them. Whether it was, that the government entertained a jealousy that the Scots, in their fickleness or disgust, would repent themselves of the Union, or that they dreaded the regalia might, upon an invasion, fall into the hands of the House of Stuart, it appears probable that the regalia have been privately removed, by a secret order from the court; for it is impossible that any governor of the castle would abstract them without authority. If, after this general surmise, so publicly thrown out, the officers of state and governor of Edinburgh Castle will not make personal enquiry, whether the regalia of Scotland be in the castle, the public will be entitled to conclude, *that they are not there*, and that they have been carried off by private orders from court."[1]

These feelings however, passed away; the memory of the regalia became like that of a tale which had been told, and their dubious existence was altogether forgotten, excepting when the superstitious sentinel looked up with some feelings of

[1] Arnot's *History of Edinburgh*, p. 292.

awe at the window of the mysterious chamber which had not been opened for a century; or when some national bard apostrophized

> ——"The steep and iron-belted rock,
> Where trusted lie the monarchy's last gems,
> The sceptre, sword, and crown, that graced the brows,
> Since father Fergus, of an hundred kings."
>
> *Albania, a Poem.*[1]

In the year 1794, the crown-room was opened by special warrant under the royal sign manual to search for certain records which it was supposed might possibly have been deposited there. The dust of a century was upon the floor; the ashes of the last fire remained still in the chimney; no object was to be seen, excepting the great oak-chest so often mentioned, which the commissioners had no authority to open, their warrant having no relation to the regalia. The crown-room was secured with additional fastenings, and was again left to solitude and silence; the fate of the honours of Scotland remaining thus as uncertain as ever.

At length, in 1817, his royal highness, the Prince Regent, now King GEORGE the FOURTH, influenced by that regard for the history and antiquities of his kingdom which well becomes his high station, and not uninterested, we may presume, in the developement of the mystery which had so long hung over these insignia of royalty, was pleased to issue his warrant to the Scottish officers of state, and other public officers therein named,

[1] These spirited lines have been adopted as the motto of an Account of the Regalia, to be had at the crown-room.

directing them to open the crown-room and search for the regalia, in order that their existence might be ascertained, and measures taken for their preservation. Oct. 28, 1817.

In virtue of this new warrant, many of the commissioners being detained by absence from Edinburgh, the gentlemen under-named assembled in the governor's house, for the purpose of executing the duty intrusted to them, viz. the Lord President of the Court of Session, the Lord Justice-Clerk, the Lord Chief Commissioner of the Jury Court, Major-General John Hope, the Solicitor-General, the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, Walter Scott, Esq., one of the Principal Clerks of Session, William Clerk, Esq., Principal Clerk to the Jury Court, Henry Jardine, Esq., Deputy King's Remembrancer in the Exchequer, and Thomas Thomson, Esq., Deputy Clerk Register of Scotland. Feb. 4, 1818.

It was with feelings of no common anxiety that the commissioners, having read their warrant, proceeded to the crown-room; and having found all there in the state in which it had been left in 1794, commanded the King's smith, who was in attendance, to force open the great chest, the keys of which had been sought for in vain. The general persuasion that the regalia had been secretly removed, weighed heavy on the mind of all while the labour proceeded. The chest seemed to return a hollow and empty sound to the strokes of the hammer; and even those whose expectations had been most sanguine, felt at the moment the proba-

bility of disappointment, and could not but be sensible, that, should the result of the research confirm these forebodings, it would only serve to show that a national affront and injury had been sustained, for which it might be difficult or rather impossible, to obtain any redress. The joy was therefore extreme, when, the ponderous lid of the chest being forced open, at the expense of some time and labour, the regalia were discovered lying at the bottom covered with linen cloths, exactly as they had been left in the year 1707, being about a hundred and ten years since they had been surrendered by William the ninth earl mareshal to the custody of the Earl of Glasgow, Treasurer-Depute of Scotland. The relics were passed from hand to hand, and greeted with the affectionate reverence which emblems so venerable, restored to public view after the slumber of more than a hundred years, were so peculiarly calculated to excite. The discovery was instantly communicated to the public by the display of the royal standard from the castle, and was greeted by the shouts of the soldiers in garrison, and of a multitude of persons assembled on the Castle-hill; indeed the rejoicing was so general and sincere, as plainly to show, that, however altered in other respects, the people of Scotland had lost nothing of that national enthusiasm which formerly had displayed itself in grief for the loss of these emblematic honours, and now was expressed in joy for their recovery.

There was found in the chest with the regalia

a silver rod or mace, topped with a globe, apparently deposited there by the Earl of Glasgow, and which proves to be the mace of office peculiar to the Treasurer of Scotland. It is mentioned in the discharge granted by the Privy-Council to Sir Patrick Murray, in 1621.

Appendix, No. III.

In order to gratify a curiosity which has something in it so generous, his Royal Highness the Prince Regent, to whom these proceedings were reported, was pleased to commit the charge of the regalia to the officers of state, that they might be exhibited to the public under proper precautions for their preservation.

July 8, 1818.

In consequence of the powers intrusted to them, the officers of state named Captain Adam Ferguson, son of the celebrated historian, and long an officer of the Peninsular army, to be the deputy keeper of the regalia. With equal propriety of selection, two yeomen keepers have been chosen, veteran non-commissioned officers of excellent character, who shared the dangers and fate of Waterloo. The room in which the regalia are now exhibited to the curiosity of the public is handsomely fitted up in the form of a tent, and where they are properly protected from the risk of injury. The dress of the attendants, being that of the ancient yeomen of the guards, as represented in a curious picture of the Duke of Albany and Queen Margaret, preserved at Luton, joined to the military medals which the men themselves have gained, has an antique and imposing appearance, well correspond-

ing with the character of the relics of ancient monarchy intrusted to their charge.

Such is the ancient history, and such the present condition of the regalia of Scotland,—a subject so naturally connected with the national antiquities of the kingdom, as to claim an important place in the present work.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

CEREMONY OF JOHN BALIOL'S DEGRADATION.

FROM WINTON'S CHRONICLE.

NOTE FIRST.

"THIS Jhon the Balliol on purpos
He tuk, and browcht hym till Munros;
And in the castell of that town,
That than was famows in renown;
This Jhon the Balliol dyspoyld he
Of all hys robys of ryaltć.
The pelure thai tuk off his tabart,
(Twme Tabart he was callyt eftyrwart)
And all othire insyngnys,
That fel to kyngis on ony wys,
Bathe scepter, swerd, crowne, and ryng,
Fra this Jhon that he made kyng,
Halyly fra hym tuk thai thare,
And made hym of the kynryk bare.
Than this Jhon tuk a qwhyt wand,
And gave up in-til Edwardis hand
Of this kynryk all the rycht,
That he than had, or have mycht,
Fra hym and all his ayris thare,
Thareft to claime it nevyr mare."

WYNTOWNIS *Cronykil*, b. viii., chap. xii., v. 13.

No. II.

RYMER, FŒD. I. 1012. Ed. 1816.

Pardonatio concessa Galfrido de Coigners, qui Coronellam Roberti de Brus cum qua se coronari fecit in Scotia, retinuit et concelavit.

REX Omnibus ballivis et fidelibus suis ad quos, &c. Salutem Sciatis quod, ad instantiam Margaretæ, Reginæ Angliæ, consortis nostræ carissimæ, pardonavimus Galfrido de Coigners transgressionem quam fecit, postquam quædam coronella aurea, de quâ Robertus de Brus, inimicus et rebellis noster, in terra nostra Scotiæ, nuper se coronari fecit, ad manus ejusdem Galfridi devenit; Coronellam illam retinendo et concelando, unde idem Galfridus coram nobis et concilio nostro occasionatus extitit et convictus. Nolentes quod dictus Galfridus per nos, vel hæredes nostros, seu ministros nostros quoscumque, inde occasionetur in aliquo seu gravetur. In cujus, &c. Teste Rege apud Karliolum xx die Martii. A. D. 1307. An. 35. Edw. I.

Per ipsum Regem nunciante thesaurario.

No. III.

NOTICES RESPECTING THE STATE OF THE REGALIA; EXTRACTED FROM THE REGISTERS OF PRIVY COUNCIL.

Apud Edinburgh, quinto Julii, 1621. *Sederunt, &c.*

Warrant to Sr Patrick Murray for deliverie of his Majesties Honnouris and Silver Plaitt.

ANENT the supplicatioun presentit to the Lordis of Secreit Counsaill be Sr Patrick Murray of Elibank, Knight, makand mentioun, that quhair the Kingis Majestie being pleasit to

committ to umquhile Sr Gedeone Murray, fader to the said Sr Patrick, the keeping of his Majesties Honnouris, to witt the Crown, sceptour, and sword, with his Majesties wholl silver plaitt of the kingdome of Scotland, and the maise callit the Thesauraris maise of the said kingdome. The said umquhile Sr Gedeone, in his tyme, deliverit the said maise to Johnne Earl of Mar, Lord Heich Thesaurair of this kingdome, to whose charge the keeping of the same apperteyned, and the Honnouris and silver plaitt he retenit in his awne keeping. And now it being the goode pleasour of God to call the said umquhile Sr Gedeone to his mercie from this mortall liffe, sua that the burdyne and charge of the saidis Honnouris, silver plaitt, and maise lyis upoun the said Sr Patrick, humelie desyring thairfoir the saidis Lordis to tak some ordour quharby the saidis Honnouris and silver plaitt may be tane af his hand, and that he may be fred, exonerit, &c. Thairfoir the saidis Lordis Ordanis the said Sr Patrik To delyver his Majesties saidis Honnouris, to witt, the Crowne, sword, and sceptour, togidder with his Majesties whole silver plaitt, quhairof his said umquhile fader had the charge and keeping, to the said Johne Earle of Marr Lord Heigh Thesaurair of this kingdome, to the effect thay may be put in his Majesties Castell of Edinburgh, and thair to be keepit be the said Lord Thesaurair to his Majesties use, and that the said Sr Patrik delyver the same with the grite aik-kist, quhairin the honnouris ar presentlie keepit, upon inventair in presence of Sr Richard Cokburne of Clerkintoun Knight Lord Privie Seill; Sr George Hay of Kinfawnis Knight Clerk of Register; Sr Robert Melvill of Bruntyland Knight, Sir Andro Hamiltoun of Redhous, and Mr Johne Wemyis of Craigtoun, or ony three of thame. The said Clerk of Register being always one whome the saids Lordis hes nominat and appointit to sie the said inventair to be cleirlie and perfytlie maid, conteining the particular nomber and soirtis of the said silver plaitt, and weyght of the same. Anent the delyverie, of the quhilkes honnouris and silver plaitt, with the aik-kyst quhairin the honnouris lyis, now appointit to be delyverit to the said Lord Thesaurair, and anent the delyverie of the maise foirsaid formerlie delyverit into him in maner foirsaid. The extract of this present act with the said Lord Thesaurair his acquittance, &c. salbe unto the said Sr Patrick a sufficient warrant.

At Edinburgh the Tent day of July, 1621.

SEDERUNT

Chancellor.	Carnegy.	Marchinstoun.
Thesaurair.	Mr of Elphinstoun.	Ridhouse.
St Androis.	Previe Seale.	Fostersait.
Melros.	Clerk of Register.	Sr P. Young.
Lauderdaill.	Justice Clerk.	Mr P. Rollok.
B. Ros.	Advocat.	Conservator.
B. Dumblane.	Kilsaithe.	
L. Erskine.	Bruntiland.	

Act in favouris of Sr Patrick Murray of Elibank, anent his Majesties Honnouris and Silver Plaitt.

The quhilk day, in presence of the Lordis of secreit counsaill, compeirit personallie Sr Richard Cokburne of Clerkintoun, Lord Prive Seale; Sr George Hay of Kinfawnis, Clerk of Register; Sr Robert Melvill of Bruntisland; Sr Andro Hamilton of Ridhous; and Mr. Johnne Weymis of Craigtoun, and reportit and declairit that they, according to the commissioun and warrant given be the saidis Lordis to thame, Convenit and mett within his Majesties Cunyeehous, within the burgh of Edinburgh, with John Erle of Mar, Lord High Thesaurair of this kingdome, upoun the sevinth day of July instant, quhair Sr Patrik Murray of Elibank, knight, eldest laughfull sone to umquhile Sr Gedeone Murray of Elibank, knight, late Thesaurair Depute of the said kingdome, produceit and exhibeit befoir thame his Majesties honnouris, to witt, his Crowne, sceptour, and swerd, togidder with his Majesties silver plaitt, quhairof the said umquhill Sr Gedeone had the charge and keeping; and that thay sighted the saidis honnouris, and remarkit the same verie narrowlie, and fand that the Crowne had in the neder circle thairof nyne garnittes, foure jasintis, three counterfeite emeraulds, four amatystis, and twentie-twa pearlis. Abone the neder Circle sax small thine triangle diamontis, ten small triangle challoms, filled with blew amalyne in steade of stones, tua small emptie challoms, haveing no thing in thame bot the blak tent, and tua challoms with tua flatt quhyte stones with the

boddum upmost, nixt abone the small challoms nyntene grite and small rag pearle, and within the roise, betuix the flour de Luce, threttie-fyve pearle sum les sum more, with ten quhyte stonis in the middis thairof. In the foure quartaris of the bonnett of the Crowne foure pearle sett in foure pecis of garniseene of gold enamaled; and in the croce abone the Crowne, ane amatist and aught perlis. And that the sceptour wes in three peeceis, haveing ane perle in the top, and ane cristell globe benethe, the head quhairof hes been brokin, and mendit with wyre. And that the swerd had the plumbett birsit and brokine, with ane voyde place in everie syde thairof, and the scabart thairof riven, birsit, and brokine, wanting some peeceis out of it. And they declairit that they causit confer all the particulars concerning thir Honnouris, with Act of Counsaill quhairby the said umquhile Sr Gedeone ressaved the saidis Honnouris fra umquhile Sr Johne Arnott, and fand thame to be conforme to the said Act in every point, and that nothing was inlaiking that wes contenit in the said Act. And siclyke thay declairit that thay causit nomber the particular soirtis of the silver plaitt, and wey the same, &c. &c. That the said Sr Patrick, immediatelie after the sighting of the saidis Honnouris, and after that the said silver plaitt was nomberit, weyed and inventarit as said is, delyverit the said Honnouris and silver plaitt to the said John Erle of Mar, in thair presence, quho causit pak and put up the silver plaitt in tua cloisse cofferis. The keyis quhairof wer delyverit to the said John Erle of Mar himself, lyke as the said Johne Earl of Mar being personallie present grantit the ressett of the saidis Honnouris, and of ane grite aik-kist, quhairin thay ar keepit, and of the silver plaitt, and maise, called the Thesauraris maise, whilk wes delyverit to him be the said umquhile Sr Gedeone in his awne tyme. Quhilk report and declaratioun maid be the said Commissioneris, and grant foirsaid maid be the said Erle of Mar, in maner foirsaid, being hard and considerit be the said Lordis, and they rypelie advysit thairwith, The Lordis of Secreit Counsaill findis and declairis, that the said umquhile Sr Gedeone hes most faithfullie, cairfullie, and honnestlie, preservit and keepit his Majesties Honnouris and silver plaitt foirsaid, fra the tyme that he ressavit the same untill the tyme of his deceis. And that the said Sr Patrik, his sone, hes most worthelie exonerit himselff of the saidis Honnouris and silver plaitt, and of the aik-kist

quhairin the Honnouris wer keepit, by making of a full delyverie of the same to the said Erle of Mar, conforme to the warrand and ordinance of the counsell given to him for that effect. And therefore the saidis Lordis exoneris, releeves, and freethis the said umquhile Sr Gedeone, the said Patrik, his sone, and thair airis and executouris of his Majesties saidis Honnouris and silver plaitt, and of the maise, callit the Thesauraris maise, delyverit be the said umquhile Sr Gedeone in his awne tyme to the said Lord Thesaurair, and of the aikkist foirsaid, and declairis thame to be free thairof for now and ever.

No. IV.

NOTICES RESPECTING THE CUSTODY OF THE REGALIA; EXTRACTED FROM THE ACTS OF THE PARLIAMENT OF SCOTLAND.

In the Parliament held at Edinburgh, Maii 15, 1650.—"Instrumentis takin be the L. M. of Argyll, wpoun the productione of the Honouris in face of Parliament, and delyverie thairoff to the Laird of Scottiscraig, in name of the Erle Marchell."

Jul. 5, 1650.—"Instrumentis takin be Sr Charles Erskein, vpon redelyverie of the Honours to be keiped or transported, as the Committie of Estates shall give ordour."

In the Parliament held at Perth, Nov. 26, 1650.—"The L. M. of Argyle, askit instrumentis wpoun the productione of the Honouris, viz. the Crown, scepter, and sword, in face of Parliament, whiche wes delyvered to the Laird of Scottiscraig, in the name of the Erle of Marischall."

Dec. 30, 1650.—"Scottscraig, in name of the Earle Marshall, tooke instrumentis vpon the production of the Honours quhich the King and Estates ordanes to be delyvered to the Marques of Argyle, in name of the Commissioners of the Thesaurarie, and if any danger be in keiping of thame, to be rewled be the advyse of the Committee of the Estaittis."

In the Parliament held at Perth, Mar. 13, 1651.—" The L. M. of Argyll, for himselff and in name of the remanent Commissioneris of the Thesurarie, did exhibeitt in face of Parliament, the Honouris, viz. the crown, scepter, and sword, and thairupon askit instrumentis, whiche wer delyvered to the L. of Scottiscraig, in name of the E. Marchell, to be keepit by him during this Sessione of Parliament."

Mar. 31, 1651.—" The L. Mongomrie, in name of the E. Marchell, askit instrumentis wpoun the reproductione of the Honouris, viz. the crown, scepter, and sword, in face of Parliament, and protestit for exoneratione thairof, quhilkis wer thane delyvered to the M. of Argyll, in name of the Commissioneris of the Thesaurarie."

In a Parliament held at Stirling on the 23d of May, 1651, *at which the King was present, there is the following entry.*—" The L. M. of Argyll, for himselff and in name of the remanent Commissioneris for the Thesurarie, askit instrumentis upoun the productione of the Honouris, viz. the Crown, scepter, and sword, for his and thair exoneratione, and thairupoun askit instrumentis, Lykas thairefter the Honouris wer by his Majesties and the Parliamentis ordour delyvered to Sr Wm Keath of Ludquhairn, in name of the E. Marchell, to be keepit during this Sessione of Parliament."

And on the last day of this Parliament, (June 6, 1651,) there are

" Instrumentis takin be the E. Marchell upoun the productioun of the Honouris with his desyre represented to the Parliament That the same might be putt in sum pairt of securitie. His Majestie and Parliament ordanes the said Erle of Marchell to caus transport the saidis Honouris to the hous of Dunnottor thair to be keepit by him till farther ordouris."

No. V.

Act of Parliament in favors of Christian Fletcher, spous of Mr James Granger, Minister at Kinneth.

Jan. 11, 1661.—Forasmuch as the Estatis of Parliament doe understand that Christian Fletcher, spous to Mr James

Granger, minister at Kinneth, wes most active in conveying the Royall Honours, his Majesties Crown, Sword, and Scepter, out of the Castle of Dunnotter, immediatly befor it was rendered to the English Usurpers, And that be her care the same wer hid and preserved; Thairfore the Kings Majestie, with advice of his Estates of Parliament, doe appoint *two thousand merks* Scots to be forthwith payed unto her be his Majesties Thesaurer, out of the readiest of his Majesties rents, as a testimony of their sence of her service aformentioned.

[Act. Parl. vol. vii. p. 11.]

No. VI.

Notes from the Records in Exchequer, showing the way and manner in which the Regalia of Scotland were taken down from, and carried up to the Castle, at the commencement and ending of the Sessions of Parliament.

Edinburgh, 9th June, 1702.—The Lord Thesaurer Deput went in his own coach with Moncrief and Mr James M'Kenzie, to the Castle of Edinburgh, and carried down, in one of the Commissioners coaches, the Honours, betwixt 11 and 12 of the clock, viz.—His Lordship the Crown, Moncrief the Scepter, and Mr Mackenzie the Sword. The Erle of Kintor was with them in the coach, and the Honors were delivered by them to Mr Wilson, one of the under Clerks of Session, at the table whereon they ly at the meetings of the Sessions of Parliament; and Deacon Lethan, smith, got the keyes of the vault and chest quhair the honors lay, from Moncrief, to help some defect in the locks, and has not returned them.

Edinburgh, 1st July, 1702, *being the day after the Parliament did rise, betwixt* 11 *and* 12 *of the clock.*—The Honors were carried up to the Castle, and were layed up in the chest within the vault. The Thesaurer Deput Moncrief, and Mr Ja. M'Kenzie, receiving them as above, in the Commissioners coach; the Erle of Kintor being with them.

Edinburgh, 5 May, about 8 *o' Clock at night,* 1703.—The Ho-

nors were carried from the Castle to the Abay; the Crown by Moncrieff; the Schepter by Mr. Ja. M'Kenzie; and the Sword by Forglan, in the Commissioners coach. And the Lord Boyll, Thesaurer Deput cam there in his own coach, and returned to the Abay, where the Honors were laid down on a table in the Commissioners presence.

Edinburgh, 17 *Septr. about* 5 *of the clock at night.*—The Honors wer carried up to the Castle, bot were not put in the chest that stands in the vaults until the next morning, at the sight of the Thesaurer Deput.

N. B.—Moncrieffe, mentioned in the foregoing Minutes, was Sir Thomas Moncrieffe of Moncrieffe, and who was, with Mr James Mackenzie, Joint Clerk of the Treasury Exchequer.

MERCHISTON TOWER.

[THOMSON.]

THIS fortalice is situated upon the ascent, and nearly about the summit, of the eminence called the Borough-moor-head, within a mile and a half of the city walls. In form, it is a square tower of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, with a projection on one side. The top is battlemented, and within the battlement, by a fashion more common in Scotland than in England, arises a small building, with a steep roof, like a little stone cottage, erected on the top of the tower. This sort of upper-story, rising above the battlements, being frequently of varied form, and adorned with notched gables and with turrets, renders a Scottish tower a much more interesting object than those common in Northumberland, which generally terminate in a flat battlemented roof, without any variety of outline. A considerable addition has been made to the house of Merchiston within these thirty years, in the form of which the architect apparently meant to maintain the character of the original building, but his purpose has been more meritorious than the execution.

Merchiston was, from an ancient period, the patrimony of the ancient family of Napier, ennobled in 1627. It is said to have been possessed by Alexander Napier, Provost of Edinburgh, in 1437,

was certainly the property of his son, Sir Alexander Napier of Merchiston, and continued to be the principal seat of that honourable family until the present generation, when it was sold by the present Lord Napier's father, but has been since re-acquired by the family.

Being so near Edinburgh, Merchiston did not escape being garrisoned during the bloody period of Queen Mary's reign, or rather of her son's, which was popularly termed the "Douglass's wars," from the share taken in them by the stern Earl of Morton. Each baron's house in Mid-Lothian was in those melancholy days attacked and defended, and the gibbet was the fate of the prisoners on both sides. Merchiston was at this time garrisoned by Morton, as were the kirk of Corstorphine, Reidhall, Craigmillar, and other tenable places, in order to straiten the Queen's party, who then lay at Edinburgh. On the other hand, the Queen's lords, as they were called, established garrisons at Livingston, Blackness, and, in especial, Seaton-Niddrie, which last, as nearest to Edinburgh, seems to have given great annoyance to the king's party. A soldier in the garrison covenanted to introduce the soldiers of Morton into Seaton-Niddrie, or West-Niddrie, by stratagem, and the night was fixed when they were to make the attempt with scaling ladders. But their accomplice betrayed their purpose. In consequence of the information which he communicated, the governor of the castle suspended beams on the outside of the fortress by ropes, which were made fast to the battlements. The assailants arrived by night, planted their lad-

ders, and receiving an answer from their supposed confederate, began to ascend, when the captain or commander of the garrison caused the ropes to be cut, and the suspended beams tumbling down on the ladders, crushed at once those who were in the act of ascending, or were crowded together beneath.

A common stratagem having been thus eluded in an extraordinary manner, the king's party resolved to assail Niddrie by open force; and to deter them from their purpose, the queen's lords issued from Edinburgh, attacked Merchiston with cannon, pierced the wall with bullets, and swept from the adjacent fields a considerable spoil of cattle. But while the garrison were entering into some treaty of surrender, a number of country people, attracted by the noise of the firing, appeared so unexpectedly, and in such numbers as to startle the besiegers, who, conceiving themselves on the point of being attacked by Morton's whole force, gave over their attack on the little fortalice, and withdrew in such disorder that they were assailed by Morton with advantage, and put to flight, throwing away their weapons, and losing some prisoners. After this, we read of another skirmish in which the garrison of Merchiston, interposing to rescue a booty which the Edinburgh soldiers were driving out of the fields, were put to the worst, Patrick Home of Polwart (an ancestor of the Marchmont family) slain, with Home of the Heuch, and others, while the riders lost only one horseman by a shot from the tower of Merchiston.

Such were the transactions of that wild time,

when the seats of the barons and gentry around Edinburgh were made fortresses, to be defended to the last extremity, or carried at the point of the sword; and when, according to the authority from which we derive these particulars, "you might have seen the father against the son, and the brother against the brother, some for defence of lawful authority, others for gain; and the inhabitants of the good town so far divided amongst themselves, that they spared not to come against each other in hostility as against a foreign and ancient enemy."[1]

We have touched on those sad times, to illustrate the history of the country. But it is not from the petty incidents of a cruel civil war that Merchiston derives its renown, but as having been the residence of genius and of science. The celebrated John Napier of Merchiston was born in this weather-beaten tower, according to the best accounts, about the year 1550; and a small room in the summit of the building is pointed out as the study in which he secluded himself while engaged in the mathematical researches which led to his great discovery.

To the inventor of the logarithms, (called from him Napier's bones,) by which process the power of calculation is so much increased, David Hume, no grantor of propositions, declares the title of a great man is more justly due, than to any other whom his country ever produced.—Yet the sublime genius which marked, by the logarithmic canon, the correspondence betwixt arithmetical and

[1] *The Historie of King James the Sext.* Edinburgh, 1804.

geometrical progression, had his weak points. Napier, like Newton, wasted time in endeavouring to discover the mysteries of the apocalypses,[1] and to ascertain prophecies, which, if intended for our instant comprehension, would (with deep respect we speak it) have been expressed more clearly; but which, so far as our weak intellects can descry, seemed to be designed for proofs of the Christian religion, which shall emerge, like so many others, when the event, very different probably from all that could have been conjectured *a priori*, shall explain that which was spoken by the prophet.

Neither was the great Napier above the superstition of his age, but believed in the connexion betwixt the mathematical and what were called the occult sciences. At least, all we know of his character inclines us rather to believe that Napier was a dupe to his own imagination, than that he desired to impose upon the opposite party, in a celebrated and very curious contract made in July, 1594, betwixt him and the noted John Logan of Restalrig. This person, renowned for his turbid ambition and dark cupidity, by which he was finally involved in Gowrie's strange and mysterious conspiracy, sets forth, that from all reports and appearances, there was treasure concealed in his old ruinous fortress

[1] [A plaine discovery of the whole Reuelation of St John, set downe in two treatises; the one searching and prouing the true interpretation thereof; the other applying the same paraphrastically and historically to the text: whereunto are annexed, certaine Oracles of Sibylla, agreeing with the Reuelation and other places of Scripture. Edin. 1593, 4to; Lon. 1611; Edin. 1641, 1645, 4to.]

of Fastcastle, on the verge of the German Ocean, near Saint Abbs-Head; and stipulates, that "John Napier should do his utmost diligence to search and seek out, and by all craft and engine to find out the same, and by the grace of God shall either find out the same, or make it sure that no such thing is there." For his reward he was to have the exact third of what was found, and to be safely guarded by Logan back to Edinburgh, with the same. And in case he should find nothing, after all trial and diligence taken, he refers the satisfaction of his travel and pains to the discretion of Logan.[1]

The battlements of Merchiston Tower command an extensive view, of great interest and beauty.

CRAIGMILLAR CASTLE.

[THOMSON.]

THIS fine old ruin, situated on the top of a gentle eminence, forms one of the most striking features in every view on the south of Edinburgh.

[1] It is curious to observe, that amongst the professors of astrology and other occult sciences, who abounded in England in the beginning of the sixteenth century, was a Dr Napper of Sandford, in Buckinghamshire, who, according to that excellent judge Lilly, "outwent Forman in physic and holiness of life, (which, by the way, required no great stretch of sanctity,) cured the falling-sickness perfectly by constellated rings, some diseases by amulets," &c. This person was pro-

The date of original erection is uncertain, but the castellated wall which surrounds the mansion appears, from a date preserved on it, to have been built in 1427. The castle and estate belonging to the family of Preston, who frequently held the highest offices in the magistracy of Edinburgh. It was acquired by Sir Simon Preston, in 1374, from one John de Capella.

Being so near to Edinburgh, Craigmillar was often occupied as a royal residence. The Earl of Mar, younger brother of James III., was imprisoned here for some time; James V. resided there occasionally during his minority; and, in the eventful 1566, Queen Mary resided there, and held, with her deceitful and double-dealing counsellors, some of those dark and mysterious councils which terminated in Darnley's death, and her own ruin. So often had Craigmillar been honoured with her residence, that the adjacent village acquired the name of Petty France, from her French guards being quartered there.

In point of architecture and accommodation, Craigmillar surpasses the generality of Scottish

bably of the stock of the Scottish Napiers, though his family had been settled in England since Henry the Eighth's time. A doubt being started whether his brother, a Turkey merchant, could prove himself a gentleman of three descents, with a view to being made a baronet, King Jamie took the matter on his own knowledge, saying, "By my saul, I will certify for Napper that he is of above three hundred years standing in his family, all of them, by my saul, gentlemen." It is possible, however, that the British Solomon tendered his evidence thus readily, because his palm itched for the baronet's fees.—See Lilly's *History of his Life and Times*, 1774, p. 11.

castles. It consists of a strong keep, or tower, flanked with turrets, and connected with inferior buildings. There is an outer-court in front, defended by a battlemented wall and flankers; and beyond these there was an exterior wall, and, in some places, a deep ditch or moat. On the boundary wall may be seen the arms of Cockburn of Ormiston, Congalton of Congalton, Moubray of Barnbougle, and Otterburn of Redford, allies of the Prestons of Craigmillar. In one corner of the court, over a portal arch, are the arms of the family, three unicorns headcouped, with a cheese-press and barrel or ton, a wretched rebus, to express their name of Preston. The inside of the great hall is stately, though not equal to that of Borthwick. In a stone window-seat is cut a diagram for playing at the game called the Walls of Troy.

Craigmillar, with other fortresses in Mid-Lothian, was burned by the English after Pinkey-fight in 1555, and Captain Grose surmises, with great plausibility, that much of the building, as it now appears, was erected when the castle was repaired after that event.

The ruin is happily surrounded with some fine old trees, which, with the varied form of the building, render it a favourite subject for the pencil. It belongs to the descendant of the great lawyer, Sir Thomas Gilmor, who acquired the property about the Revolution.

ROSLIN GLEN, AND HAWTHORNDEN,

[TURNER, THOMSON, AND SCHETKY.]

Roslin is scarcely more fortunate in its own scenery, than in the romantic and classical vicinage of Hawthornden. The narrow glen which connects these two celebrated spots is one of those beautiful and sequestered valleys, which so often occur in Scotland, and generally where they are least to be expected, from the appearance of the general landscape. It often happens, that, amid an open and comparatively uninteresting country, where there is little to interest the traveller, he is conducted by the course of some fairy stream into a dell abounding with all the romantic varieties of cliff, and copsewood, and waterfall, through which the brook has found itself a more wild and pleasing course than along the surface of the more level ground.

The vale of Roslin is precisely of this description. You may in many places approach its very verge without being aware of its existence; and, on the other hand, when you have descended into its recesses, you seem to be in a primitive wilderness. The cliffs which arise on each side of the dell are pleasingly varied, and present themselves to the spectator as the shattered ruins of some ancient building, of which some parts still stand firm in all their former strength, while others, broken and shattered, impend over and threaten

the spectator. The copsewood with which they are clothed, wherever the roots can find room or subsistence among the chasms of the rocks, adds inexpressible beauty to the scene, especially in spring, when the green leaves are in all their first tenderness of colouring, and in autumn, when they have received the gorgeous, but melancholy tints, which betoken their approaching fall. It is only to be regretted that few of these beautiful trees have been permitted to grow to full size. The pathway, alternately ascending towards the verge of the rocks and descending into the bed of the river, winding amongst the various obstacles which the situation of the ground, the digressions of the stream, and the projecting masses of rock, offer to a more direct progress, has that delightful intricacy which at every step presents new and interesting points of view, giving, even to objects which we have already seen, all the interest of novelty as we approach or recede from them. In some places the track has that slight degree of danger which adds pleasure to the walk, to all who are not constitutionally timid. But it is telling a tale which has been repeated a thousand times, to say, that a morning of leisure can scarcely be anywhere more delightfully spent than in the woods of Roslin, and on the banks of the Esk. In natural beauty, indeed, the scenery may be equalled, and in grandeur exceeded, by the Cartland Crags, near Lanark, the dell of Craighall, in Angus-shire, and probably by other landscapes of the same character which have been less celebrated. But Roslin and its adjacent scenery have other associations, dear to the anti-

quary and the historian, which may fairly entitle it to precedence over every other Scottish scene of the same kind.

The architecture of its beautiful Gothic chapel has been elsewhere treated of at length, and by a hand well entitled to classify and particularize its various beauties. The mouldering ruins of the castle, with its tremendous triple tier of vaults, were long the abode of the proud family of the St Clairs, whose titles at one period of their history would have wearied a herald, yet who were, perhaps,

——"not so wealthy as an English yeoman."

This mouldering fabric has been often described in detail, with all the legendary additions extracted from Father Hay's manuscript. Some forty years ago or more, we remember the moderate and comparatively modern mansion, which has been erected amidst the ruins of the old castle, inhabited by a genuine Scottish laird of the old stamp, the lineal descendant of the high race who first founded the pile, and the last male of their long line. His figure was, with exception of that of Douglas Duke of Hamilton, almost the only one we recollect which carried our imagination back to the Scottish barons and warriors of antiquity, who, each lords and monarchs within their own domains, scarce knew how to pay homage to sovereignty itself. The last Roslin (for he was uniformly known by his patrimonial designation, and would probably have deemed it an insult in any who might have termed him Mr Sinclair) was a man considerably above six

feet, with dark grey locks, a form upright but gracefully so, thin-flanked and broad-shouldered, built, it would seem, for the business of the war or the chase, a noble eye of chastened pride and undoubting authority, and features handsome and striking in their general effect, though somewhat harsh and exaggerated when considered in detail. His complexion was dark and grizzled, and, as we schoolboys, who crowded to see him perform feats of strength and skill in the old Scottish games of golf and archery, used to think and say amongst ourselves, the whole figure resembled the famous founder of the Douglas race, pointed out, it is pretended, to the Scottish monarch on a conquered field of battle, as the man whose arm had achieved the victory, by the expressive words, *Sholto Dhuglas*—"behold the dark grey man." In all the manly sports which require strength and dexterity, Roslin was unrivalled; but his particular delight was in archery. It was he who announced to each candidate who was admitted into the Royal Company of Archers, that he became the member of no private association, but of a body who had the privilege of acting as the King's Body-guard, should his Majesty ever visit his ancient metropolis, the limits of their service being Edgebucklinbrae on the east, and Cramond Bridge on the west of the city. It is not known on what document or tradition Roslin founded this claim; but it was indulged to the Royal Company of Archers by the condescension of his present Majesty, and they had the distinguished honour of performing the functions of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners, in a

manner highly creditable to themselves, during the late residence of his Majesty at Holyrood. It was Roslin also, who, possessing the hereditary office of Grand Master of the Scottish Masons, surrendered to the brotherhood the right of electing that officer in future. In grateful acknowledgment of this munificent renunciation of an ancient privilege, the memory of the Laird of Roslin is always remembered among the flowing cups of the fraternity. His last bed is made, where it is said twelve barons of his race lie in their armour, instead of shrouds, betwixt two of the pillars of the chapel, the bases of which are slightly indented to make way for his corpse, in consequence of his uncommon stature. The estate descended to Sir James Erskine St Clair, now Earl of Roslin, who represents the family. Those recollections of boyhood mingle with others of a later and more affecting description. Under the fine Gothic drop called the Star of Bethlem, lies the late beautiful Countess of Roslin, [born Miss Bouverie,] in whom passed untimeously from the world so much that was amiable, witty, and accomplished. The author of this article, frequently her guide through this admired scenery, may be pardoned so brief a tribute to the memory of a lady whom none who knew can recollect without sorrow.[1]

After leaving Roslin, we pass the caves of Gorton, situated in the front of a high cliff on the southern side of the stream, yet having their entrances so much obscured by bushes and brambles,

1 [The Countess died in 1810.]

that it requires perfect acquaintance with the spot to discern them. These caverns are obviously the work of human hands, and being cut in the form of a cross, it has been supposed they were originally the abode of hermits. The inference does not seem unavoidable; for, oesides the religious idea attached to the form of the cross, it presents considerable accommodation to those who might not care to open too extensive a vault for fear of the roof falling in. At any rate, it is well known, that, during the unhappy reign of David II., whilst Scotland was overrun by the English, who had garrisons in the principal fortresses of the country, a gallant knight, Sir Alexander Ramsay of Dalwolsey, found refuge in these caves, with a band of chosen patriots, and acquired such renown at the time, that no youth was held in account for valour, until he had served a certain time under his standard. With these followers Ramsay not only annoyed the English garrisons, but made excursions as far as Northumberland, and retaliated upon the English frontier the evils of his suffering country.

The local antiquary, also, seldom fails to point out the neighbouring moor of Roslin, as the scene of a celebrated battle, fought 24th February, 1302, in which the Scots, under Comyn, then guardian of the kingdom, and Simon Fraser, attacked and defeated three armies, or, more properly three divisions of the English, on the same day. The action is probably somewhat exaggerated, being one of the brief glimpses of prosperity which shone on the Scottish armies during that disastrous

period. But even the English writers acknowledge a considerable defeat, owing to the incautious conduct of Sir John Segrave, who suffered his army to move in three bodies, so far separated from each other, as to be incapable of mutual support.

Amid these scenes of historical remembrance and natural beauty, the footpath down the river conducts the stranger to Hawthornden, the classical habitation of the poet Drummond, which is seen to most advantage from the opposite side of the river. Being built with some view to defence, a consideration in Scotland even till the middle of the seventeenth century and later, the house rises from the very edge of the grey cliff, which descends sheer down to the stream. The house, which is small and not very convenient, was repaired by the poet, with the following inscription: —"*Divino munere, Gulielmus Drummondus, ab Hawthornden, Joannis Equitis aurati filius, ut honesto otio quiesceret, sibi et successoribus instauravit*, 1638."

Under the mansion lie those subterranean caves which have excited so much speculation amongst antiquaries. They are simply small apartments, hewn out of the solid rock with much labour, which connect with each other by passages of disproportionate length. A spring-well, hewn with much labour, shows that these melancholy dwellings were designed for more than a brief space of retirement. Although it may be difficult to say whether they are the rude dwellings of an aboriginal race, who thus burrowed in the earth like wild

beasts, and made their constant abode in the bowels of the rock—or whether they were constructed at a later period, as a temporary retreat, when the public calamities rendered the ordinary habitations of mankind unsafe, we may safely conclude, on the whole, that pressing necessity alone could reconcile human beings to such dreary mansions. Of this latter kind of caves, there are many in Scotland, as upon the banks of the Teviot, the Jed, and other rivers; but they are much more rude, and much less complicated, than those of Hawthornden. The entrance to these caves was of late laid bare, by the fall of a part of the cliff in which they are hewed.

On the south side of the house of Hawthornden, and so situated as to have contributed in some sort for its defence, stand the ruins of an old tower, the abode of the poet's ancestors; and save that they enjoyed the benefit of God's daylight, it seems one which cannot have been much more comfortable than the caverns themselves. Through this lies the entrance to the more modern house; and the neighbourhood of the rude and ruinous pile adds much to the romance of the whole situation. A sort of seat, cut in the rock adjacent to the house, is called the Cypress-grove, because frequented by Drummond while engaged in composing a moral treatise on the vanity of human life, to which he gave that name.

It is impossible to see Hawthornden, and mention its poetical owner, without thinking upon the time when

——"Jonson sate in Drummond's social shade."

and lamenting the loss of Ben's

> ———"journey into Scotland song,
> With all the adventurers."———

And from thence it is with anxiety that we find ourselves urged upon something like a controversy with the learned, acute, and ingenious editor of Jonson's works, who, in his zeal to do full justice to his subject, has, we think, offered some undue injury to the memory of Drummond. The attempt has indeed been prohibited to us, under a heavy denunciation.[1] We presume, nevertheless, in all honourable courtesy, to take up the gage which is thus thrown down, and venture the following remarks on the memorable interview of Drummond of Hawthornden and the great English dramatist, and the brief account which the former has left of the manners and opinions of Ben Jonson.

That Ben Jonson did Drummond the distinguished honour of visiting Scotland, partly with a view of spending some time with a man whom he esteemed—that he accordingly lived about three weeks at Hawthornden, and was gratified by Drummond's hospitality—that they parted friends, and remained in an amicable intercourse until death—are facts on which all are agreed; as also, that in the shape of loose memoranda, Drummond has preserved some severe censures passed by Jonson upon other poets, and added a very unfa-

[1] "Enough of Drummond, with whose 'friendship' for our author the common sense of the reader will, I trust, no longer be insulted, except from the lips of hopeless idiotism—*longa manantia labri saliva.*"—*Memoirs of Ben Jonson*, p cxxxv. Gifford's edition of *Jonson's Works*, vol. i.

vourable picture of the dramatist's self-opinion, as well as of his intemperance, his literary jealousies and peculiarities, the laxity of his speculative opinions, and other foibles which darkened his great qualities. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ.*

These scraps of information, for they are nothing more, may be considered in two points of view, as they affect the character of Jonson, or that of Drummond; in other words, as they contain truth with respect to the former, or as they infer malice and calumny (whether in themselves true or false) on the part of him who recorded them.

On the first point, it is not easy to discover Mr Gifford's opinion. He seems to receive as truth what circumstances Drummond has narrated concerning Jonson's birth, parentage, and earlier adventures; and far from doubting the accuracy of his report concerning Jonson's criticisms on contemporary authors, he only regrets that they are not sufficiently detailed. It is therefore apparently only where Drummond bears testimony to Jonson's failings, that the editor, in laudable zeal for the honour of his author, is disposed to impugn his testimony.

If this scepticism were limited to the supposition that Jonson's deficiencies were considerably exaggerated in Drummond's mode of viewing them, we consider it as highly justifiable. They met, probably for the first time, in close and prolonged collision; and it happens almost universally, that disappointment ensues when such familiarity takes place betwixt an author of genius and one of his ardent admirers. Trifling defects, which in other

men we do not notice, because they are what we expect to find, strike us powerfully when attached to characters, which, judging from their writings, one would desire to find perfect; as vanity and epicurism, slight faults in ordinary persons, disgust us when we find them unexpectedly united with high intellectual powers and moral qualities. Drummond probably felt disappointed at finding so much genius as Jonson possessed marred by the usual mixture of human frailty; and it might be said in this case, as in a thousand, *Minuit præsentia famam.* Again, it must be allowed, that Drummond and Jonson were men so different in genius and situation, that it may have been difficult for the former to attain a just, or at least an accurate, estimate of the latter. His own powers did not much exceed a decent mediocrity, while Jonson had all the eccentricity of genius. Drummond had lived a retired scholar, within his paternal shades; Jonson was a man of the world, a man of the town, accustomed to the freedoms of the Mermaid, and whom, without doing him much injustice, we may suppose scarce amenable at all times to the rules of strict etiquette. As a person of some quality, and rather an amateur of letters than a professed author, Drummond probably might be cautious and punctilious, timid in delivering his opinions, and apt to be surprised, and even shocked, at the uncompromising strength of conception and expression natural to Jonson, who had struggled during a long life for the character of intellectual superiority, amid a body of competitors as bold and as zealous, if not as deserving, as himself. The essential points of difference,

without diminishing what regard they had for each other, may have caused Drummond to consider Jonson as an imperious egotist; and perhaps, were we in possession of the Scottish Journal, or the facts on which it was founded, we might learn that Jonson considered his host as pedantic, limited in his views, and attached to the trifling punctilios of ceremony and aristocratic society.

If we allow for the exaggerations arising from these discrepancies, we may perhaps be of opinion that the character of Jonson, as drawn by Drummond, contains much in which we are apt to acquiesce, after perusing his life and his works. He is described as opinionative, and disposed to snatch the laurel, if it was not conceded—such is the tone of his prologues, in which he "swears his play is good." His panegyrics and satires are such, as might well entitle us to think him a partial friend, and a bitter antagonist. Drummond does justice to the generosity of his temper, when he describes him as hasty in censure, but turning his resentment on himself if he was well answered; his being of "imagination all compact," and inclined to hypochondria, is proper to him, both as a poet, and as having a constitution affected by scrofula; his attachment to sack he himself has confessed, and it is recorded by his biographer. Some indifference, if not as to religion, at least as to the distinguishing tenets of the English and Roman, may be allowed to belong to him who changed his faith twice. If these points are admitted, and united with a temper hasty and prone to satire, we

see not that Drummond has done Jonson much injustice in what he has recorded concerning him.

It has been, however, very strongly urged, that Drummond, in preserving these memoranda respecting Jonson's manners and disposition, acted with base treachery towards one who had unbosomed himself before him in all the full assurance of confiding friendship, for such a degree of intimacy is assumed to have subsisted between them. Indeed, this seems to be the principal object in the ingenious editor's reasoning, as a skilful counsel, when a hard fact is proved against his client, endeavours to get rid of it by throwing discredit on the evidence. And here we will frankly admit, that if we saw the least purpose, on the part of Drummond, to make these remarks public to the prejudice of Jonson, either before or after his own death, we should think him guilty of a very gross abuse of hospitality. The editor of Jonson seems, indeed, to allege that this latter was Drummond's intention; and he quotes the well-known story of Bolingbroke's legacy to Mallet, which has no other connexion with the case in point, than in so far as there was a Scotchman in both.[1] And if Drummond's birth-

[1] [Lord Bolingbroke bequeathed his library, and the property of all his own writings, to David Mallet the poet, for posthumous publication. "The wild and pernicious ravings, under the name of 'Philosophy,' which were thus ushered into the world, gave great offence to all well-principled men. Johnson hearing of their tendency, which nobody disputed, was roused with a just indignation, and pronounced this memorable sentence upon the noble author and his editor:—'Sir, he was a scoundrel and a coward: a scoundrel for

place is to be considered as a misfortune, it is some consolation that it is one which Jonson narrowly escaped.[1] But not only is there no evidence whatever, that these notes were designed for publication, but every inference, from internal evidence, goes to establish the contrary. Drummond appears to have been, like most authors of his class, rather feverishly anxious about the correction of such works as he designed for the press; and there is a large collection of them in the library of the Antiquarian Society of Edinburgh. But in these the heads of his conversation with Jonson are not found; nor have they, in any respect, the appearance of having been fairly engrossed or prepared for the press. They are, on the contrary, meagre commonplaces, irregularly and carelessly jotted down as they occurred to the author's recollection, and without the least attempt at those ornaments of style and expression, which Drummond peculiarly affects in the discourses which he designed for the public. Nay, farther, carelessly as they are thrown together and expressed, there is great reason to doubt whether we have them at present in the form in which they were left by the author; for the remarks of the editors are mingled with those of Drummond in such a manner, as to give us no

charging a blunderbuss against religion and morality; a coward, because he had not resolution to fire it off himself, but left half a crown to a beggarly Scotchman to draw the trigger after his death.' "—CROCKER'S *Boswell*, vol. i., p. 255.]

1 By the way, if Jonson's grandfather actually came from Annandale, his name must have been anglicized on his expatriation. There are no Jonsons, or Johnsons, in that district, but Johnstones full many.

assurance that they either tell us all which he said, or in the order in which he said it. It is therefore not only imperfect as left by the writer, but most probably garbled as published by his executors, with whom accuracy does not seem to have been exactly respected. And this being the case, Drummond, who neither published these obnoxious notices himself, nor left them in a shape to be published by others, may be fairly exculpated from charge of treachery, which has been so harshly urged against him.

If we might hazard a conjecture concerning the purpose of these memoranda, it would be that they were designed, in the first place, to assist the author's own recollections of the conversation and manners of his distinguished guest, and perhaps with the purpose, at some future period, of putting those recollections in a shape fit for publication, when, doubtless, the description of Jonson would have received those softening and alleviating touches, by means of which a painter converts the original caricatured sketch of his portrait into a perfect and pleasing resemblance. We can conceive nothing more reasonable or proper than to have meditated such a design, and nothing more natural, than that the author should have neglected to execute it, and left his materials in their original crude state.

With respect to the kind of friendship in which Jonson and Drummond seem to have lived, it was a literary intimacy only; and what is the friendship of wits, no one, says Dr Johnson, was ever fool enough to enquire. These letters, so far as pre-

served, relate chiefly to literary subjects; nor are we disposed to attach much value to the occasiona. complimentary expressions, which probably meant no more than similar turns of civility in modern correspondence. Drummond's letters appear to be considerably colder than Jonson's; but, so far as the hospitality of Hawthornden created any obligation, (on which we are little disposed to insist,) that obligation was conferred by the host, and received by the guest.

We have only to add, that the idea of attaching cold-blooded, premeditated, motiveless calumny to Drummond, on account of his having judged of the manners of a man of genius, with whom he was well acquainted, more harshly than we are disposed to view them at the distance of two centuries, and surrounded with the *halo* of well-earned reputation, is totally inconsistent with all we know of his life and habits. His memory has been uniformly handed down to us as that of an amiable and retired scholar, loved by his friends, and respected by the literary men of his time. There were other points of his character which should entitle him to a candid construction from the ingenious critic, for he did not hesitate to wield his pen in defence of the falling monarchy; and his loyal grief for the death of Charles I. is said to have hastened his own.

Thus much, while strolling around the ruins of Hawthornden, we should have said to any Southern visitor, in defence of its elegant and accomplished owner. There are so many—so very many points on which we should distrust our own judg

ment, and defer to that of the editor of Jonson, that we may be excused for differing from him respecting the character of Drummond. If Ben Jonson has suffered by the means of these unfortunate memoranda, time has made him amends, by affording him the assistance of the most acute, accurate, and intelligent editor, that ever used his pen in illustration of dramatic antiquity.

Claudite jam rivos——

PALACE OF LINLITHGOW.

[TURNER.]

LINLITHGOW, distinguished by the combined strength and beauty of its situation, must have been early selected as a royal residence. David, who bought the title of Saint by his liberality to the church, refers several of his charters to his town of Linlithgow, and in that of Holy Rood expressly bestows on the new monastery all the skins of the rams, ewes, and lambs belonging to his Castle of Linlitcu which shall die during the year.

The convenience afforded for the sport of falconry, which was so great a favourite during the feudal ages, was probably one cause of the attachment of the ancient Scottish monarchs to Linlithgow, and its fine lake. The sport of hunting was

also followed with success in the neighbourhood, from which circumstance it probably arises that the ancient arms of the city represent a black grey-hound-bitch tied to a tree. Tradition, however, ascribes other causes for this remarkable emblem, but is, as usual, rather inconsistent in accounting for it otherwise. One legend says, simply, that such a hound was found so tied on the small island on the east side of the loch. Another tradition hints at a witch who used to assume this shape. A third more ungallantly adopts a metaphorical meaning, and affirms that a mistress of one of the kings was designated under this hieroglyphic. A Celt, according to Chalmers, might plausibly derive the name of Linlithgow from *Lin-liath-cu*, the Lake of the Greyhound. Chalmers himself seems to prefer the Gothic derivation of *Lin-lyth-gow*, or the Lake of the Great Vale. *Non nostrum est.*

The Castle of Linlithgow is only mentioned as being a peel, (a pile, that is, an embattled tower surrounded by an outwork.) In 1300 it was rebuilt or repaired by Edward I., and used as one of the citadels by which he hoped to maintain his usurped dominion in Scotland. It is described by Barbour as "meikle and stark and stuffed weel." Piers Luband, a Gascoigne knight, was appointed the keeper, and appears to have remained there until the autumn of 1313, when the Scots recovered the castle under the following interesting circumstances:—

There was, says our authority, Barbour, dwelling in the neighbourhood of Linlithgow, a stout-hearted husbandman, named William Binnock

who, observing that the Scots were on every hand recovering from the English the castles and fortresses which the invaders possessed within Scotland, could not brook that the peel in his vicinity, which was large, strong, and well supplied with arms and garrison, should remain unassailed. He formed a stratagem, equally remarkable for ingenuity and audacity. The garrison was usually supplied by Binnock with hay, and they had lately required from him a fresh supply. He assured them of the excellence of the forage, and undertook to send it in early in the morning. But the hay was so arranged on the wain as to conceal eight well-armed and determined men; the team was driven by a sturdy peasant, who bore a sharp axe under his gaberdion. Binnock himself walked beside the waggon, to superintend, as it seemed, the safe delivery of the forage. The porter, on approach of Binnock, with his well-known wain, lowered the drawbridge and raised the portcullis. Just in the very gateway, the driver, as he had been instructed, drew his axe suddenly and cut asunder the soam, or tackle, by which the oxen were attached to the waggon. Binnock at the same instant struck the warder dead, and shouted the signal word, which was "Call all, call all." The assailants jumped from amongst the hay, and attacked the astonished garrison. The wain was so placed, that neither could the gate be shut nor the portcullis lowered, nor the bridge raised, and a party of Scots, who were in ambush for the purpose, rushed in to second their forlorn hope, and were soon masters of the place.

Bruce, faithful to his usual policy, caused the peel of Linlithgow to be dismantled, and worthily rewarded William Binnock, who had behaved with such gallantry on the occasion. From this bold yeoman the Binnies of West Lothian are proud to trace their descent; and most, if not all of them, bear in their arms something connected with the waggon, which was the instrument of his stratagem.

When times of comparative peace returned, Linlithgow again became the occasional residence of the sovereign. In 1411 the town was burned by accident, and in 1414 was again subjected to the same calamity, together with the church and palace of the king, as is expressly mentioned by Bower.[1]

The present church, which is a fine specimen of Gothic architecture, having a steeple surmounted by an imperial crown, was probably erected soon after that calamity.

The palace arose from its ashes with greater splendour than before; for the family of Stuart, unhappy in so many respects, were all of them fortunate in their taste for the fine arts, and particularly for that of architecture. The Lordship of Linlithgow was settled as a dowry upon Mary of Gueldres, in 1449, and again upon Margaret of Denmark, in 1468.

James the Fourth, as splendid as gallant, seems to have founded the most magnificent part of Linlithgow palace; together with the noble entrance betwixt two flanking towers bearing on rich entablatures the royal arms of Scotland, with the

[1] *Combusta est Villa regia de Linlithqu, navis etiam ecclesiae ejusdem et palatium regis de nocte.*—Bower, b. 14, ch. iii.

collar of the Order of the Thistle, Garter, and Saint Michael.

James IV. also erected in the church a throne for himself, and twelve stalls for the Knights-Companions of the Thistle. It was sitting here, in the time of public worship, and musing, perhaps, on his approaching invasion of England, that he received a singular advice from a singular personage, which we cannot express better than in the words of Pitscottie:—

"At this time the King visited Linlithgow, where he was at the Council, very sad and dolorous, making his prayers to God to send him a good success in his voyage. And there came a man clad in a blue gown, belted about him with a roll of lining, and a pair of *brottikines* on his feet, and all other things conform thereto. But he had nothing on his head but side hair to his shoulders, and bald before. He seemed to be a man of fifty years, and came fast forwards, crying among the lords, and specially for the King, saying, that he desired to speak with him; while at the last he came to the desk where the King was at his prayers. But when he saw the King, he gave him no due reverence nor salutation, but leaned him down gruffly upon the desk, and said, 'Sir King, my mother has sent me to thee, desiring thee not to go where thou art purposed, which if thou do, thou shalt not fare well in thy journey, nor none that is with thee. Farther, she forbade thee, not to mell nor use the counsel of women, which if thou do, thou wilt be confounded and brought to shame.' By [*the time*] this man had spoken these

words to the King, the even-song was near done, and the King paused on these words, studying to him an answer. But in the meantime, before the King's eyes, and in presence of the whole lords that were about him for the time, this man evanished away, and could be no more seen. I heard Sir David Lyndsay, Lyon-herald, and John Inglis, the Marishall, who were at that time young men, and speciall servants to the King's grace, thought to have taken this man, but they could not, that they might have speired [*asked*] further tidings at him, but they could not touch him."[1]

Buchanan confirms this strange story on the word of a spectator, Sir David Lyndsay, whose testimony he describes as unimpeachable. Thus supported, we have only to choose betwixt a deception and a supernatural appearance. The temper of James was one of those described by the poet as being "of imagination all compact." He was amorous, devotional, and chivalrous. This renders it highly probable that the simulated vision was contrived by some of the numerous party who advised a continuance of peace with England, and who might be of opinion that counsels conveyed in this mysterious manner might have some effect on the romantic spirit of the King. It is usually supposed that the vision was intended to represent Saint Andrew; but the use of the words, "my mother," seems rather to imply the apostle John, who indicated by that term the Virgin Mary.

[1] Pitscottie, vol. i., p. 264-5. [See *Marmion*—Sir Walter Scott's *Poetical Works*, vol. vii., p. 202-7, and Appendix, *Note L.*]

The death of James IV., and rout of his army, clouded for many a day the glory of Scotland, and marred the mirth of her palaces. The next adventure which occurred worthy of notice, relates to a domestic feud.

In 1517 an event took place during the minority of James V., singularly illustrative of the barbarous manners of the age. Squire Meldrum of Binns, whose feats of chivalry have been celebrated in verse by Sir David Lyndsay of the Mount, had formed an intrigue with the Lady Gleneaglis. A cruel knight (Sir Luke Stirling of Keir) envied his successful love, and set upon the valiant squire betwixt Leith and Edinburgh with fifty armed men, when Meldrum had only eight in his company. Notwithstanding this fearful odds, Meldrum fought as he was wont, and the good squire would have slain Sir Luke Stirling on the spot, had not the knight's chief servant, Tom Gifford, prevented the blow, receiving in doing so a wound which disabled him for ever. Meldrum was at last borne down to the ground, after the most valiant resistance, in which he slew Sir Luke's principal servant, hurt that knight himself, and killed and wounded six-and-twenty of the party. He was here hamstringed, mutilated, and left for dead on the spot.

But the deed did not pass altogether unavenged. De la Bastie, then Lieutenant-Governor of Scotland under the Duke of Albany, sounded to horse, got his guards together, and pursued the assassins so closely that they were compelled to take refuge in "a peel-house in Linlithgow." This afforded them no refuge, for it was instantly assaulted by

De la Bastie, and the defenders compelled to surrender themselves. They were condemned to death, but not executed, though Sir Luke Stirling suffered long imprisonment at Edinburgh and Dunbar. The fair lady for whose sake the skirmish was fought, lamented, as we are assured by Sir David Lyndsay, like Penelope for Ulysses, but the lovers never met more. As for the squire, he forsook the worship of Mars and Cupid, for that of Esculapius, and became, from the interest with which he had seen the medical men operate on his wounds, himself a skilful surgeon. This was rather a derogatory conclusion for so great a champion, but we are assured that he practised his new art without fee or reward.[1]

Mr Chalmers seems to be of opinion that this peel-house, in which the cruel knight sought for refuge, was the palace of Linlithgow itself, which he observes must have been slightly guarded.[2] It was more probably one of those little towers, of which every town had several at the time, and which were often defended after the town itself was entered by an enemy.

[1] "Bot he sa lang lay into pane,
He turnit to be ane chirurgiane:
And als be his naturall ingyne,
He learnit the art of medicyne.
He saw thame on his bodie wrocht,
Quharefor the science was deir bocht,
Bot afterward quhen he was haill,.
He spairit na coist not yit travaill,
To prief his practikis on the pure,
And on thame previt monie ane cure;
On his expensis without rewaird,
Of money he tuik na regaird."
LYNDSAY'S *Works*, vol. ii., p. 301.

[2] *Caledonia*, vol. ii., p. 854.

James V. was much attached to Linlithgow, and added to the palace both the chapel and parliament hall, the last of which is peculiarly striking. So that when he brought his bride Mary of Guise there, amid the festivities which accompanied their wedding, she might have more reasons than mere complaisance for highly commending the edifice, and saying that she never saw a more princely palace. It was long her residence, and that of her royal husband, at Linlithgow. Mary was born there in an apartment still shown; and the ill-fated father dying within a few days of that event, left the ominous diadem which he wore to the still more unfortunate infant.

It is remarkable that during this reign, there was acted at Linlithgow, in presence of the king, queen, and whole court, and, so far as appears, with great applause, a play, or theatrical presentation, by Sir David Lyndsay, called the "Satire of the Three Estaites," in which much coarse and indelicate farce and buffoonery is intermixed with the most pointed censure upon the affairs both of church and state. The comic mummery was undoubtedly thrown in with the purpose of Rabelais, to mitigate the edge of the satire, by representing the whole as matter of idle and extravagant mirth. But when the serious and direct tenor of the piece is considered, no one can doubt that the prince, before whom it was acted, and by whom it seems to have been well received, meditated innovations both in church and state, however diverted from them by the arts of the churchmen.[1]

[1] [See *ante*, vol. vi., p. 272.]

In the subsequent reign of Queen Mary, Linlithgow was the scene of several remarkable events; the most interesting of which was the assassination of the Regent Murray by Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh. This is a story so often, and so well told, that it would be idle for us to do more than merely allude to it. The incident has been lately the subject of a beautiful painting, by William Allan of Edinburgh; now the property of the Duke of Bedford. The house in which Bothwellhaugh lay in ambush is still partly standing, but a modern front has injured its appearance of antiquity. Persons, however, are yet alive who remember the wooden balcony, which, with the narrowness of the street at that particular part, gave advantage to the aim of the lurking assassin. The carabine with which the deed was done is still preserved at Hamilton Palace. Perhaps the recollection of the indomitable spirit of revenge exhibited in this memorable action, led to an atrocious instance of deep vengeance, which was taken by a person of lower life for a slight offence, and after a long interval of time, in the same town of Linlithgow.

It occurred in the beginning of the seventeenth century. One Crawford, while a boy at the school at Linlithgow, had been stripped of his coat, by a small proprietor, who found him trespassing on his grounds. Crawford went afterwards abroad, and rose to some rank in the army, but this unatoned affront still rankled in his bosom; and returning to Linlithgow, after an absence of many years, he avenged the indignity by poniarding the person at whose hand he had sustained it, and that on the

very spot. He was beheaded at the Cross, and his head was long seen on the south side of the Church.[1] When it is considered that vice is of an epidemic as well as contagious character—that the commission of any act of horrid notoriety often gives birth to similar conceptions in the minds of kindred spirits—that deep calls to deep, and crime occasions crime—it is not altogether impossible that the murderer Crawford may have been hardened in his deadly purpose by his mind dwelling upon the stern vengeance of Bothwellhaugh.

James VI. loved the royal residence at Linlithgow, and completed the original plan of the palace, closing the great square by a stately range of apartments of great architectural beauty. He also made a magnificent fountain in the palace-yard, now ruinous, as are all the buildings around. Another grotesque Gothic fountain adorns the street of the town, which, with the number of fine springs, leads to the popular rhyme:

> "Linlithgow for wells,
> Stirling for bells."

The town in other respects is not very remarkable except for some antiquity of appearance which is gradually disappearing, as the citizens require better accommodations than were afforded by the old-fashioned lodgings, which, as in France and Flanders, presented not the front, but their gable ends to the street. It consists of one long street, varying in breadth, and, which is rather unusual, narrowest at the centre of the town.

[1] See *Statistical Account of Linlithgow.*

Among the attendants of James the Sixth was a distinguished personage, of a class which may be found in most places of public resort. This was the celebrated Rob Gibb, the king's fool or jester. Fool as he was, Rob Gibb seems to have understood his own interest. Upon one occasion it pleased his sapient Majesty King Jamie to instal Rob in his own royal chair, the sport being to see how he would demean himself as sovereign. The courtiers entered into the king's humour, overwhelming Rob Gibb with petitions for places, pensions, and benefices, not sorry perhaps to have an opportunity of hinting, in the presence of the real sovereign, secret hopes and wishes, which they might have no other opportunity of expressing But Rob Gibb sternly repelled the whole supplicants together, as a set of unmercifully greedy sycophants, who followed their worthy king only to see what they could make of him. "Get ye hence, ye covetous selfish loons," he exclaimed, "and bring to me my own dear and trusty servant, Rob Gibb, that I may honour the only one of my court who serves me for stark love and kindness." It would not have been unlike King Jamie to have answered, "that he was but a fool, and knew no better."

Rob's presence of mind probably did not go unrewarded; for either on this, or some future occasion, he was in such "good foolery" as to get a grant of a small estate in the vicinity of the burgh. "Rob Gibb's contract—stark love and kindness"—is still proverbial in Scotland to express a match for pure love. It was happily applied

as a toast after a wedding, in which the bridegroom's name happened to be Stark, and that of the clergyman who performed the ceremony Robert Gibb.

When the sceptre passed from Scotland, Oblivion sat down in the halls of Linlithgow; but her absolute desolation was reserved for the memorable era of 1745-6. About the middle of January in that year, General Hawley marched at the head of a strong army to raise the siege of Stirling, then pressed by the Highland insurgents under the adventurous Charles Edward. The English general had expressed considerable contempt of his enemy, who, he affirmed, would not stand a charge of cavalry. On the night of the 17th he returned to Linlithgow, with all the marks of a defeat, having burned his tents, and left his artillery and baggage. His disordered troops were quartered in the Palace, and began to make such great fires on the hearths as to endanger the safety of the edifice. A lady of the Livingston family, who had apartments there, remonstrated with General Hawley, who treated her fears with contempt. "I can run away from fire as fast as you can, general," answered the high-spirited dame, and with this sarcasm took horse for Edinburgh. Very soon after her departure her apprehensions were realized; the Palace of Linlithgow caught fire, and was burned to the ground. The ruins alone remain to show its former splendour.

The situation of Linlithgow Palace is eminently beautiful. It stands on a promontory of some elevation, which advances almost into the

midst of the lake. The form is that of a square court, composed of buildings of four stories high, with towers at the angles. The fronts within the square, and the windows, are highly ornamented, and the size of the rooms, as well as the width and character of the staircases, are upon a magnificent scale. One banquet-room is ninety-four feet long, thirty feet wide, and thirty-three feet high, with a gallery for music. The king's wardrobe, or dressing room, looking to the west, projects over the walls so as to have a delicious prospect on three sides, and is one of the most enviable boudoirs we have ever seen.

There were two main entrances to Linlithgow Palace. That from the south ascends rather steeply from the town, and passes through a striking Gothic archway, flanked by two round towers. The portal has been richly adorned by sculpture, in which can be traced the arms of Scotland, with the collars of the Thistle, the Garter, and Saint Michael. This was the work of James V., and is in a most beautiful character.

The other grand entrance is from the eastward The gateway is at some height from the foundation of the wall, and there are opposite to it the remains of a *perron*, or ramp of mason-work, which those who desired to enter must have ascended by steps. A drawbridge, which could be raised at pleasure, united, when it was lowered, the ramp with the threshold of the gateway, and when raised, left a gap between them, which answered the purpose of a moat. On the inside of the eastern gateway is a figure, much mutilated, said

to have been that of Pope Julius II., the same Pontiff who sent to James IV. the beautiful sword which makes part of the regalia.

"To what base offices may we return!" In the course of last war, those beautiful remains, so full of ancient remembrances, very narrowly escaped being defaced and dishonoured, by an attempt to convert them into a barrack for French prisoners of war. The late President Blair, as zealous a patriot as he was an excellent lawyer, had the merit of averting this insult upon one of the most striking objects of antiquity which Scotland yet affords. I am happy to add, that of late years the Court of Exchequer have, in this and similar cases, showed much zeal to preserve our national antiquities, and stop the dilapidations which were fast consuming them.

In coming to Linlithgow by the Edinburgh road, the first view of the town, with its beautiful steeple, surmounted with a royal crown, and the ruinous towers of the palace arising out of a canopy of trees, forms a most impressive object. All that is wanting is something of more elevated dignity to the margin of the lake. But it is not easy to satisfy the inconsistent wishes of amateurs.

We may, in taking leave of this subject, use once more the words of old Sir David of the Mount, in his complaint of the Papingo :—

> "Farewell, Lithgow, whose palace of pleasaunce
> Might be a pattern in Portugal or France."

SETON CHAPEL.

[E. BLORE.]

THE Setons, Earls of Winton, were one of the most distinguished families, whether in respect of wealth, antiquity of descent, or splendour of alliance. They took their original name from their habitation, Seaton, "the dwelling by the sea," in East Lothian, where, it is said, their founder, Secker, was settled by King David I. Others, less probably, suppose that Secker's name being De Say, was conferred on his new acquisition. Here the Setons continued to flourish, producing many characters distinguished in history, until the middle of the fourteenth century, when the estate descended to Margaret Seton, who married Alan de Wyntoun, a neighbouring baron. This match was so displeasing to her own relations, that it occasioned a deadly feud, in consequence of which, as we are assured by the Prior of Lochleven, in his Chronicle, one hundred ploughs in Lothian were laid aside from labour, a circumstance which Lord Hailes justly founds upon, as a proof of the advanced state of agriculture in that province at a period so early. A son of this disputed marriage continued the family of Seaton in his eldest son, Sir John; and his second son, Sir Alexander, who married the heiress of the house of Gordon, founded a line still more powerful than his own, who suc-

ceeded to the honours of the Huntly family, and founded other subordinate lines of the same genealogy, which is still termed that of the Seton-Gordons.

Passing over many a *Miles acerrimus, Anglisque infestissimus*, who fought and fell in their country's cause, we find, in Queen Mary's time, that George, Lord Seton, was one of her most determined and attached friends, although he seems to have had no marked concern with any of those intrigues which brought on her misfortunes. It was he who attended her with a chosen party of horse after her perilous escape from Lochleven; and after the battle of Langside, this faithful lord was reduced to such extremities during his exile abroad, that for two years he is said to have driven a waggon in Flanders to procure subsistence. His picture in this occupation, and the garb belonging to it, was painted at the lower end of the gallery in the ancient palace of Seton.

There is another picture of this nobleman well worthy of notice. It is a family-piece, comprehending the Lord Seton, his lady, and four children, painted in a hard but most characteristic style, by Sir Antonio More. The group slope from each other like the steps of a stair, and all, from the eldest son down to the urchin of ten years old, who is reading his lesson, have the same grave, haughty, and even *grim* cast of countenance, which distinguishes the high feudal baron, their father. This very curious portrait was published in Mr Pinkerton's Ichnographia, after the original, then in possession of the late excellent Lord Somerville,

and which is now the property of the present lord, whose ancestor was married to Lord Seton's sister. This picture (often under the eye of the present writer during moments of much social happiness) is one of the most celebrated monuments of art belonging to Scottish history, and cannot be looked on without awaking the most powerful recollection of those feudal times, when conscious power, and the dangers as well as privileges which attend upon it, impressed on the countenance of the possessor a character so different from that worn by his successor, whose voice is no longer law within his baronial domains.

After the time of the Reformation, which was obstinately opposed by George, Lord Seton, his successors, though several of them conformed to the Protestant faith, and though all were devoted royalists, did not much interfere with the management of public affairs. In James VIth's time, they attained the dignity of Earls of Winton, and continued to flourish until the time of George, the fifth and last who enjoyed that dignity, and the large and plentiful fortune which was annexed to it.

This unfortunate nobleman was the son of the fourth Lord Seton, and Christian, daughter of John Hepburne of Aderstone, that nobleman's second wife, whose marriage afterwards became the subject of a law-suit between the young earl and the Viscount Kingston, next heir of the family. The earl had early shown a caprice of temper, said by a contemporary to be a family attribute; [1] for, having quar-

[1] See his character in Mackay's *Memoirs*.

relled with his father, he resided abroad for two years, in the capacity of a journeyman blacksmith, and none of his friends knew where to find him when he succeeded to the earldom. In 1715 he entered into the rebellion, and joined the Viscount of Kenmore with a fine troop of horse. It seems to be intimated in the histories and memoirs of the period, that the higher command was assigned to Lord Kenmore, in consequence of the waywardness and uncertainty of the Earl of Winton's character.

Yet, if we allow for the rashness of entering into this adventure, Lord Winton's opinions, so far as we know them, seem to have been sound and well considered. When, at the instance of the Northumbrian insurgents, the march into England was resolved upon, the Earl of Winton opposed it strenuously, proposing, with great force of reasoning, that they should rather seize upon Glasgow, and then march towards the north-west to join General Gordon with the western clans, who were advancing from Inverary. Favoured by such a diversion, General Gordon would have had little difficulty in crossing at the Heads of Forth, since Mar being at Perth with a considerable army, the Duke of Argyle could have detached no great part of his small force to defend these fords; and thus placed betwixt two armies, he must have abandoned Stirling, and perhaps Edinburgh.

When this plan was rejected, the Earl of Winton, with most of his troop, left the insurgents, and though he afterwards returned, he was never again invited to their councils of war, and was otherwise treated with marked disrespect. These slights,

according to Patten, gave the earl but little trouble; he continued to amuse himself with such company as chance threw in his way, and entertained them with stories of his travels and adventures in low life. In the affair of the barricades at Preston he behaved with spirit and gallantry; and afterwards, when waiting his fate in the Tower, made good use of his mechanical skill, sawing through, with great ingenuity, the bars of the windows, through which he made his escape. He ended his motley life at Rome, in 1749, and with him closed the long and illustrious line of Seton, whose male descendants have, by intermarriage, come to represent the great houses of Gordon, Aboyne, and Eglinton. Their estate was forfeited, and has since passed through several hands.

The House, or rather, as it was commonly termed, the Palace of Seton, was destroyed about thirty years since. It was a strong extensive turreted building, was much ornamented after the fashion of the sixteenth century, though some parts were much older. The house, together with the church, or chapel, was surrounded with a loop-holed and turreted wall. It was strong enough to afford a temporary defence to the party of the Highlanders under Mackintosh of Borlum, called Brigadier Mackintosh, who threw themselves into it when sent across the Firth, by the Earl of Mar, in 1715. Mackintosh thus effected his junction with the insurgents under Winton and Kenmore, and finally shared at Preston the fate of the lord of the castle, which had for a time afforded him protection.

The Collegiate Church of Seton, which is now

all that remains to attest the splendour of the family, stood within the walls of the palace. It is small, roofed with stone, and exhibits the foundation of a spire, which has never been completed. It was tolerably endowed by the family of Seton, having been founded, at an early period, as the parochial church, and, augmented by the addition of various other establishments, was rendered collegiate by the second lord of that name, in the time of King James IV. Grose has recorded various particulars respecting the foundation, extracted from a curious pedigree of the family of Seton, written by Maitland of Lethington, and continued by Lord Kingston, whose branch of the family was next to the direct line. From this it may be learned how Katherine Sinclair, wife of the first Lord Seton, built an aisle on the south side in addition to the church, and "theek'd" it with stone, with a sepulchre for herself and her issue. Also, how Lord George, the third of Seton, roofed the choir, repaired the desks, glazed the windows of the same, and bestowed vestments on the officiating priests. Moreover, that Jane, widow of this third Lord George, pulled down Dame Katherine Sinclair's aisle, and rebuilt the same in better proportion, so as to complete the figure of the cross; and how her bounty went farther, and equipped the church and priests therein serving with a complete *stand* (*i. e.* suit) of purple velvet, flowered with gold, and another of white crimson velvet, embroidered in the same manner, not to mention suits of white damask, silk-camlet, and black worsted, besides plate for the altar, and other meet ornaments.

In the same work may be found the more melancholy record, how the English, in the inroad under Hertford, 1544, despoiled the church of Seton of those good things, and every thing else which could be carried off, destroyed the kirk, and burned the timber work.

There are still visible some stately monuments of the lords of Seton and their ladies, mouldering into decay, as their race is falling into oblivion. A long Latin epitaph, printed by Grose, extols the fidelity of the fifth Lord Seton, the friend of the unhappy Mary. It commemorates his steadiness amidst the sufferings of a country which English, French, Germans, and Spaniards, had made the theatre of their contentions, rendered more horrible by the civil wars among the Scots themselves, and the prudence with which he thrice restored his house, thrice ruined by the foreign enemy. His courage, his exertions, and his calamities, have been now long forgotten by all but the antiquaries, who can scarce spell out the record of them on the broken inscription. A long addition contains an account of the baron's relatives and descendants, still more forgotten than himself.

With these brief notices we might dismiss farther consideration of the miserable remains of the magnificent house of Seton. Yet it is not altogether alien to a plan, embracing Scottish antiquities of every description, to observe, that there formerly subsisted, close by the palace, a village inhabited by a class of persons termed *Rentallers*, or *Kindly Tenants;* cottagers, that is, who had no right to show for their possession excepting their being

entered in the lord's rental-book as possessors of the various petty tenements, which they enjoyed for trifling returns, the principal advantage derived by the baron being, doubtless, his having the benefit of their ready military service in case of his having, in the expressive, though oblique, phrase of those old times, "aught to do." This was a general system throughout Scotland; but it was peculiar to the rentallers of Seton, that they denied the right of the proprietor of this estate, who purchased it from the crown after the forfeiture, to remove them from their possessions, and consequently claimed them as a heritage. By a judgment of the Supreme Court they were declared tenants at will, which decision has ruled all such cases in future, excepting that of the kindly tenants of Lochmaben, who, living upon the lands attached to the royal castle of Bruce, and protected by some peculiar provisions in the Scottish statutes, are considered as enjoying a permanent right in their possessions, according to the rental-book.

Indeed, it is evident that the existence of such villages when the cause of their establishment had ceased, as inhabited by mean possessors, independent of the will of the proprietor, and situated at his very door, must have been, while they continued, an exceeding nuisance, which could only be removed by exorbitant purchases, though the rentallers were no longer required to render, or, if demanded, could not legally give, the consideration of personal service, for which the possessions had been granted to their ancestors.

DIRLETON CASTLE.

[THOMSON.]

THIS castle, situated in the most fertile part of Scotland, became early a place of great importance. It belonged to a branch of the great family of De Vallibus, or De Vaux, which was powerful in both kingdoms. From the ruins still extant, it seems to have been a mighty fabric.

In 1298, after a long and desperate defence, Dirleton surrendered to Antony Beck, the martial Bishop of Durham, who besieged it in behalf of Edward the First. If in the month of July the English soldiers subsisted during this siege upon the beans and pease which they picked up in the fields, it gives, as Lord Hailes observes, a good proof of the attention paid to agriculture in East Lothian even at that early period.

The castle was probably, like other Scottish fortresses, much enlarged and strengthened by the English, after they obtained possession of it. There are many warrants from Edward I. for providing it with stores, and it is given at one time, during that reign, to the keeping of the brother of Thomas de Kingston.

In the reign of Robert Bruce, Dirleton was acquired by the valiant and once powerful family of Haliburton, whose chief intermarried with the

daughter and heiress. Their descendants, Lords of Dirleton Castle, made a great figure in Border history, and founded several families of high consequence, not one of which now exists in male succession, excepting the Border family of Haliburton of Muirhouselaw, represented by David Haliburton, Esq.

After the extinction of the Haliburton race, Dirleton seems to have passed to the family of Ruthven, and was the bribe which the last unhappy Earl of Gowrie held out to the cupidity of Logan, his associate in the memorable conspiracy. It seems to have been coveted by that person in the highest degree. "I care not," says Logan in his correspondence, "for all the other land I have in the kingdom, if I may grip of Dirleton, for I esteem it the pleasantest dwelling in Scotland." But Dirleton, included in Ruthven's forfeiture, passed to other hands, and was bestowed on Sir Thomas Erskine, who had lent the King active assistance against the efforts of the conspirators. He was created Viscount Fenton Baron Dirleton.

In the civil wars, Dirleton was for a time occupied by a party of the Scottish *guerilla*, called then moss-troopers. Monk marched against them with four pieces of ordnance and a mortar; he was joined by Lambert, and besieged the place, which having surrendered at discretion, the captain of the moss-troopers, one Waite, and two of his followers, were executed by martial law. This was in the year 1650.

Dirleton Castle became, after the Restoration, the property of Sir John Nisbet, King's Advocate.

His male line having become extinct in the person of the late Mr Nisbet of Dirleton, the property descended to his daughter, Mrs Fergusson of Raith.

The ruins are situated upon a rock near the village of Dirleton. The parish church stood of old in the village of Gulane, and there is a story of James VI. having deprived a curate of that living, because he persevered in the heinous crime (as it seemed to his Majesty) of smoking tobacco.

INNERWICK CASTLE.

[THOMSON.]

THIS, as appears from the view, is a ruinous fortress of very small extent, situated, as is usual, on the edge of a precipitous glen. It does not exceed the limits of an ordinary Border place of strength, rather calculated to resist a temporary inroad than to sustain any thing like a siege in war, or in time of peace to accommodate a baronial family. It belonged to a younger branch of the great family of Hamilton, chiefly remarkable for having produced that eminent lawyer and statesman, Sir Thomas Hamilton, familiarly denominated "Tom of the Cowgate," who, acquiring an immense fortune, founded the Earldom of Haddington, a noble house, in which talent has been long hereditary.

The castle itself is mentioned by Patten in his Account of Somerset's expedition, much in the same gossiping, yet lively manner, which renders his journal so interesting. It is founded, as he informs us, about a mile from Dunglas, and is nearly opposite to a pile or fort, called Thornton, as, by the way, was frequently the situation chosen by contiguous lords, that their dwellings might afford to each other mutual defence. Tom Trotter, the proprietor, or governor, of Thornton, locked up about sixteen foot soldiers in his house, to make the best defence they could, while he himself, after some parley, "pricked off with his prickers," or light horsemen. Innerwick was defended by a similar garrison; and as both refused to surrender to Somerset, they were honoured with an assault with large cannon, while hagbutters were placed so as to prevent the defenders from appearing at the windows. Thus situated, the handful of men in the two towers were soon compelled to retreat to the battlements, while, according to the process used in such attacks, the assailants, forcing the entrance of the lower apartment, filled it with wet straw, and endeavoured, by setting it on fire, to smother the defenders. By these and other means of annoyance, the little garrison of Innerwick was compelled to surrender; but great part were put to the sword before the terms granted by Somerset could be conveyed to the assailants. Thornton was not more fortunate. The defenders, perceiving no chance of relief, showed a white flag in token of submission; but, as it was not immediately accepted, pulled it down, and again commenced their

fire. This being considered as an offence against the rules of war, they were condemned to be put to the sword, and had suffered accordingly, but that one amongst them wearing a *red doublet*, was supposed by the assailants to be an Englishman, in consideration of which, not without some gentle animadversions on the part of the reverend author upon ill-timed clemency, they seemed to have been spared.

It must be remarked, the animosity must have been very rancorous which could devote these poor men to death for defending the charge committed to them against such fearful odds, and, notwithstanding the natural humanity of Somerset, there occurred in this expedition several instances of the like inhumanity; and, in truth, the war between the sister countries assumed, about this period, a character of inveterate ferocity unknown to earlier times, when it was waged less in hate than in rivalry of honour.

The means of destruction employed were also more formidably effective. Innerwick was burnt; but Thornton and the neighbouring Castle of Dunglas were blown up with gunpowder, and thus more effectually demolished than had been customary in former wars, when, though the interior of the fortresses was often destroyed, the walls, from their massive thickness, usually remained little injured.

Such is the brief chronicle of the siege of Innerwick, about which the most remarkable circumstance is perhaps that which shows that red was already considered as the national colour of England.

CASTLE OF DUNBAR.

[TURNER.]

THE eastern coast of Scotland, from Berwick to the mouth of the Frith of Forth, is bound round with a barrier of inaccessible rocks and shoals, which rendered the few harbours it affords places of the utmost consequence, from an early period of Scottish history. That of Dunbar, though capable only of receiving small vessels, was farther made important by the vicinity of a very strong castle, which, built within the sea-mark upon several rocks, connected together by fortifications, was, before the invention of gunpowder, esteemed almost impregnable. Very little now remains of what was, in former years, an extensive, as well as a formidable castle. The gate leading to the keep or donjon is the most perfect part of the ruins, and still exhibits several shields with armorial bearings, amongst which are those of the Duke of Albany, bearing the arms of the Isle of Man, Dunbar, and Annandale, quartered with those of Scotland, as on the Trinity Church in Edinburgh. We shall presently see that the bearer of these arms had a particular interest in the citadel which they adorn. Of the other coats many are defaced.

Excepting this gate, and one or two fragments presented in the view, the massive vestiges of the castle which remain are scarcely to be discerned,

in colour or shape, from the rude dark rocks on which they are founded; yet an antiquary may discover that these fragments belong to different ages, during the course of which the edifice was renewed, or its plan enlarged with additional defences. Beneath the reef of rocks which sustains these stern memorials of a warlike age, run several caverns, some of them to a great extent, through which the tide, when in strong current, rages with awful fury. The highest and largest of these vaults is stated, with little probability, to have been occupied as a prison. It seems more likely to have been used as a place for securing the boats and skiffs belonging to the garrison.

It has frequently happened, in the course of this work, that more frequent and important historical recollections have been attached to places of which slight vestiges now remain, than to others which still continue in a state nearly entire. The remembrances connected with these rude vestiges of former strength and consequence, are interwoven with the History of Scotland. The Castle of Dunbar was accounted, from an early period, the key to the eastern part of that kingdom.

The manor of Dunbar, with many other possessions, was conferred by Malcolm Canmore upon Patrick, Earl of Northumberland, a princely fugitive, who retired into Scotland from the wrath of William the Conqueror, and whose name and title, *Comes Patricius*, are contracted by our historians into Cos Patrick, or Gospatrick, by which his descendants, created Earls of Dunbar and March, were afterwards for a length of time distinguished.

If the Castle of Dunbar does not owe its actual foundation to this illustrious exile, who obtained the grant in 1072, it must have been much enlarged by him.

In the wars of Bruce and Baliol, Patrick, eighth Earl of Dunbar and March, adhered to the English interest, and hence the infamy with which the name of Gospatrick is pursued in history, tradition, and legend. But while the Earl of March followed the English banners, his wife, Margery Comyn, surrendered his castle of Dunbar to her countrymen of Scotland, choosing rather to betray the trust of her husband than the fealty she owed to her country. Earl Warrene was despatched, with Edward I.'s usual celerity, to press the siege of this important place. Unprepared for sustaining a blockade, the garrison agreed to surrender, unless relieved within a time specified. The assembled force of Scotland marched to their succour; but, with the same ill conduct which usually attended their military operations on a large scale, they hazarded a battle on disadvantageous ground, and were defeated with great slaughter. The garrison of Dunbar, on approach of the Scottish army, had exultingly spread their banners, and upbraided the English with the popular reproach, that the curse of Saint Augustine had endowed the English with an appendage proper to quadrupeds alone, in all systems except that of Lord Monboddo. "Come hither, ye long-tailed hounds," they exclaimed from their battlements, "and we will cut off your tails for you." Their note was changed, however, on the total defeat of their countrymen, and the castle

was forced to surrender at discretion. This fatal battle was fought 28th April, 1296; and about 350 years afterwards, Cromwell defeated the Scots on almost the same ground, and under similar circumstances of rashness on their part, and military skill on that of the English commander.

The ninth Earl of Dunbar and March followed his father's politics, and adhered to the English while they could maintain a party in Scotland. Even after the fatal defeat at Bannockburn, he continued to espouse their interest, opened the gates of his castle of Dunbar to the fugitive Edward II., "full gently" received him, and dismissed him safely to Berwick by sea. This was honourable, because Cospatrick must have had in his thoughts at that time the making his peace with his native monarch, and could not be ignorant how easily and advantageously he might have done so, by detaining in custody the person of the King of England.

Cospatrick afterwards submitted himself and his fortress to Robert Bruce, and continued to serve his country with fidelity until the luckless battle of Halidon Hill, when it was generally thought the Scottish nation was so thoroughly subdued, that no man remained, with power to bring an army together, and skill to lead it when assembled.

The Earl of March, who commanded Berwick for the Scottish, surrendered after the loss of the battle, became anew the liegeman of John Baliol, or rather of England, and engaged himself to repair his castle of Dunbar, and garrison it, for the English. This was in 1333; but in 1334, Cos-

patrick had quitted the English cause once more, and with open solemnity renounced his allegiance to Edward III., as he advanced with a mighty army into Scotland in the autumn of that year. The earl himself kept the field with the Regent of Scotland, and did gallant service. In the meantime, his castle of Dunbar had perhaps its most brilliant epoch.

This stronghold was left by the earl under the command of his heroic countess, Agnes Randolph, daughter of the celebrated Randolph, Earl of Murray, and grand-niece of Robert Bruce. She was well known at the period, and is still dear to popular tradition, by the name of Black Agnes of Dunbar. This heroine, at a time when almost all the fortresses in the south of Scotland were subdued by the enemy, defended Dunbar with a zeal and magnanimity worthy the illustrious blood which flowed in her veins; and, while the captivity of one regent, and the inexperience of another, seemed to precipitate the ruin of the Scottish nation, a woman retained firmly within her grasp one of the most important keys of the kingdom. Dunbar being of the utmost consequence to both parties, the English laid close siege to it, under the command of a renowned leader, Montague, Earl of Salisbury. But he met with a more than equal adversary in Black Agnes, who, surmounting the timidity of her sex, showed herself on the walls with the indifference of a veteran, and when the battering engines flung massive stones and fragments of rock on her battlements, she caused her maidens, as if in scorn, to wipe away the dust with

their handkerchiefs. When the Earl of Salisbury caused bring up to the walls a huge military engine, called the sow, intended, like the Roman *testudo*, to protect those employed to undermine the walls, Black Agnes, perceiving him on horseback, directing the operation, called out to him, in a scoffing rhyme,

> " Beware, Montagow,
> For farrow shall thy sow."

An enormous rock was then discharged on the engine by her commands, which crushed it to pieces, while the countess and her attendants ridiculed the unfortunate pioneers, as they escaped in confusion, and termed them the litter of pigs belonging to the English sow. Ritson admitted the Countess Agnes into the list of Scottish poets upon the strength of that single couplet; from the record of Scotland's heroes none can presume to erase her. The obvious jest of the sow's farrowing having passed to other countries, the same story is told, perhaps truly, of Judge Banks's lady, while holding out Corffe Castle against the Parliament forces; which I only mention for the sake of introducing my friend Mr William Stewart Rose's lines, as applicable to either the Scottish or English heroine, though written in allusion to the last. The author addresses Corffe Castle, in which the reader may remember that one Edward was murdered, and another detained prisoner. But, continues the poet,

> ——— " Not the double guilt
> Of king captived, or foully spilt.
> Hath laid thy towers on earth.

The cause, fair Corffe, which wrought thy fall,
Had brought a blessing on thy wall,
Had fortune followed worth.

"'Twas when you rear'd, mid sap and siege,
The banner of your rightful liege,
At your she-captain's call;
Who, miracle of womankind!
Lent mettle to the meanest hind
That mann'd her castle wall.

"What time the banded zealots swore,
Long foil'd thy banner'd towers before,
Their fearful entrance made,
To raze thy walls with plough and harrow;
Yet oft the wild sow cast her farrow,
And well the boar was bay'd."

To return from Corffe Castle to that of Dunbar, we must record another remarkable incident which distinguished this memorable siege. The Earl of Salisbury, conceiving he had gained over to his interest the warder of one of the gates of the castle, treated with him for the admittance of an English force, which he proposed to lead in person. The warden, in appearance, agreed to the English general's proposal, but, in reality, betrayed it to his lady. He was directed to promise admission at a certain hour, when, the countess being prepared for their reception, the portcullis was dropped on those who had entered. Salisbury narrowly escaped, but his armour-bearer, Copeland, with others, remained a prisoner. "Aha, lord earl!" exclaimed the countess to Montague, as she saw him retreating in all haste, "you have disappointed us! We thought to have had your company at supper, and that you would have enlisted with us to keep this our castle against the robbers of England."

Notwithstanding the repeated disappointment of his attempts, Salisbury continued his attack, and the countess her defence, with the same obstinacy, until a long blockade, maintained by sea and land, had reduced the place to extremity. Fortunately the heroic Sir Alexander Ramsay of Dalwolsey heard of the distress of the castle. He embarked with forty resolute men, and, under the cover of a dark night, entered the castle by a postern from the sea, relieved the wants of the garrison, and sallying next morning upon the unwary besiegers surprised them by storming their posts, and putting all to the sword.

The siege, which had lasted six weeks, was now abandoned by the English, and their leaders even made a truce with the victorious Scots, neither safe, honourable, nor profitable to the English, says one of their own chroniclers, but acceptable and useful to the Scottish; and this turn in her fortunes Scotland owed to the defence of Dunbar by Black Agnes Randolph.

George, tenth Earl of Dunbar and March, the son of the gallant Countess Agnes, was a brave and wise leader, but had not her fortune, or perhaps her spirit of patriotism. At least the bonds of loyalty hung as loose on that powerful Border noble as on some of his predecessors, who seemed to have transferred their precarious allegiance from one kingdom to the other, as best suited their own interest. On a quarrel with Alexander, Duke of Albany, brother of James III., and at that time his brother's chief counsellor, the earl retreated into England, and left his son-in-law, Maitland, to defend his

Castle of Dunbar against the Scottish forces. But Maitland seems soon to have surrendered the charge, and while the Earl of March continued in England. The Earl of March himself found refuge at the English court, and rendered various services to Henry IV., not only in the Scottish wars, but at the battle of Shrewsbury, where his military talents contributed to decide the fate of the day against the celebrated Hotspur. And as that memorable name recalls us to the scenes of Shakspeare, we may remark that the letter upon which Percy makes such characteristic comments,[1] is supposed to have been addressed to him by this same Earl of Dunbar and March, whose concurrence in his conspiracy he had solicited, but who thought it more prudent to remain on the king's side.

While the Earl of March was engaged in the English service, his large estate and seignories underwent forfeiture, and, with his hereditary Castle of Dunbar, passed to the crown nominally, but, in truth, into the hands of his enemy, Alexander, Duke of Albany, who was at the same time created Earl of March. And although the Earl Patrick made his peace with his native prince, yet it was at the expense of a considerable part of his domains. Nor does it appear that he obtained repossession of Dunbar Castle, which it perhaps suited the ambitious schemes of Albany to retain. The gateway, already noticed as the most entire part of the present ruins, was probably built by him, as it bears his armorial insignia, in which his

[1] [See I. King Henry IV. Act II. Scene III.]

native coat of Stewart is quartered with the feudal bearings of Annandale, March, and Man. But the stronghold was wrested from his grasp, as from that of its hereditary owner, after it had sheltered his retreat on a remarkable occasion, which, though it leads us a little from our present purpose, may serve to enliven a dull series of dates and antiquarian deductions.

Alexander, Duke of Albany, brother of James III., and one of the most remarkable characters in his day, is painted by old Lindsay of Pitscottie in colours proper to the feudal prince. "He was hardy and manly, and wise, so that they (the Lords and barons of Scotland) stood in more awe of him than of the king's grace, for his manhood. This Alexander was of a mid stature, broad shouldered, and well proportioned in all his members, and specially in his face; that is to say, broad-faced, red-nosed, great-eared, and of very awful countenance, when he pleased to show himself to his unfriends." We may add from history, that he was as ambitious as he was bold and manly, and exercised in the realm an authority almost equal to that of the sovereign.

A character like the Duke of Albany was easily rendered suspected to a prince of a jealous and timid disposition like James III., who, moved by the insinuations of favourites, and, as it is said, by dread of a prophecy, that he was to fall by means of his nearest of kin, resolved on the destruction of his brother. More than once a reconciliation was patched up between them; and on one of these occasions, James III., having mounted a hackney

to ride from the castle to Holyrood Abbey, refused to move on till his brother had mounted behind him, when they rode on the same horse down the High Street of the metropolis, an edifying spectacle of fraternal concord, which, however, did not long remain unbroken. In consequence of new suspicions, or the revival of old griefs betwixt the brothers, Albany was committed to the Castle of Edinburgh, and his death was privately determined by the king at the instance of these plebeian favourites, to whom this weak prince resigned the management of his power and of his conscience.

The imprisoned duke received information of the designs of his brother through the following stratagem :—A vessel from France arrived in the roads of Leith, and sent ashore two small casks of choice wine for the use of the imprisoned prince. These passed through the guards without suspicion, and reached the duke's hands in safety. The prince, with his chamberlain, (*Scottice*, chamber-chiel,) was confined in a tower or apartment which arose from the northern verge of the rock on which Edinburgh Castle is founded, where the height of the precipice seemed to bar all possibility of escape. But the means for surmounting this obstacle were afforded by the contents of the barrels, one of which, besides wine, contained a coil of ropes, and a letter, enclosed within a cake of wax, warning the Duke of Albany that his life depended on his immediately breaking from his confinement. His scheme was quickly formed, and daringly executed. The captain of the castle, after he had gone his rounds, was invited into the Duke's apartment to partake of a

collation, and to play at dice with his princely captive, as well as to taste the excellent wine with which the duke had recently been supplied. He came accordingly, with three attendants, who were heartily plied with wine, while the duke engaged the officer in a game of tables. The game interested the officer deeply, and the heat of the fire and rapid supply of wine diminished his caution so much, that the duke struck him to the heart with a whinger ere he was aware that violence was intended. His three attendants, disordered with liquor, and taken by surprise, shared the same fate; four men being thus assaulted and slain by two. The duke cast their bodies upon the ample grate, in which a large fire was burning. The keys, which were at the captain's belt, supplied them with the means of escaping from the strong room to the battlements. The chamberlain then essayed to descend by means of the rope which had been provided; but, as it proved several yards too short, he fell, and broke his leg in the fall. The sheets on the duke's bed supplied the means of lengthening the rope, and he himself descended without injury. Notwithstanding the exigence of the moment, he scorned to leave his faithful domestic to the fate which awaited him when his master's escape was discovered; but, taking him upon his back, transported him to a place where he might be safely concealed, and then completed his own escape by going down to the sea-coast, where a skiff lay ready to carry him on board the French vessel.

According to most authorities, and especially to

that of Lesley, the Duke of Albany landed at his Castle of Dunbar, and put it in order of defence, then proceeded to France, where he afterwards married the Duchess of Bouillon, and resided in that kingdom until 1482.

Meanwhile his Castle of Dunbar was besieged by the royal army, under the command of Lord Evandale, then chancellor. The place does not appear to have made a strenuous resistance on this occasion; but by a singular fatality, three knights, and one of distinction, amongst the besiegers, the Lairds of Luss and Craigie-wallace, with Sir William Shaw of Sauchie, were killed by the same cannon-ball. The garrison of the castle, and other aiders of the Duke of Albany, Home of Polwarth, Andrew Jackson, David Chirnside, and others, who, by their names, seem to belong to the Merse or East-Lothian, were declared forfeited by parliament, 1480.

In 1482, the Duke of Albany left France for England, and by a disgraceful league with the English monarch, who promised him a dependent sceptre, and a dilapidated kingdom, when their joint arms could subdue it, entered Scotland, and took possession of Berwick. Here a peace was patched up between the nations, by the terms of which Albany, renouncing his more ambitious pretensions, was restored to his Scottish domains, and amongst others to the possession of Dunbar Castle. But he had not been in Scotland many months ere the nobility, suspecting his views, compelled him to a second flight. On this occasion, which occurred in 1483, Albany left his Castle of Dunbar in the

hands of an English garrison, who defended it vigorously and successfully against the efforts of the Scottish, then much disunited, to wrest it from their hands. On the 21st September, 1484, a truce of three years was concluded betwixt England and Scotland, in which a singular clause respected Dunbar. That fortress and its garrison were to have for six months the full benefit of the cessation of arms; but the king of Scotland was to be at liberty, within six weeks after the lapse of that term, to notify to the King of England his intention that Dunbar should no longer be comprehended within the pacification, and, having done so, was to be at liberty to recover that important possession by force, if he could. Such was the weakness of King James III., that he could not avail himself of this provision until the midst of the winter of 1485-6, when, advancing to Dunbar in the depth of winter, he once more restored that important place to its native sovereign.

It was the general policy of Scotland that very few castles should be maintained on the frontiers, both because the poverty of the kingdom was unequal to sustaining adequate garrisons, and because, as we observe in the history of Dunbar, they often fell into the hands of an enemy better skilled than the Scottish in the art of attacking and defending strong places. In the spirit of this policy, and moved by late events, an Act of Parliament was passed in 1488, which directs the Castle of Dunbar to be casten down and utterly destroyed, in such manner as to render it incapable of repairs in time to come, "because," said the statute, "it has done

great skaith in time bygone, and it were great danger to the realme if it were negligently keeped in future."

It does not appear that this ordinance was carried into execution till near a century afterwards. Dunbar is one of the royal castles in which James IV. infefts his bride, Queen Margaret of England, in security of her marriage contract.

Dunbar is not much mentioned in history after the surrender in 1486, until the minority of Queen Mary. From the account of Patten, it would seem that Somerset, during the invasion of Scotland in 1547, passed the castle under the fire of some of its artillery, from which he experienced no damage.

During the eventful regency of Mary of Guise, Dunbar, garrisoned by her French troops, was a cause of great jealousy to the Lords of the Congregation, and their allies of England. By the final treaty betwixt these parties, in 1560, it is agreed that all the French soldiers were to be dismissed, excepting sixty to garrison Inchkeith, and as many in Dunbar; and it is especially stipulated, that the new works which had been added to the fortress should be demolished without delay.

In the year 1567, the unfortunate Queen Mary had conferred the keeping of this important place on the object of her misplaced favour, the too celebrated Bothwell, in part of the recompense of his "great service and exorbitant expenses," and also because his friends, kinsmen, tenants, and servants, dwelt for the most part adjacent to the said castle and strength of Dunbar. For maintaining this service, she assigns the crown lands of

Easter and Wester Barnes, the lands of Newtoun-Leyis, the lands called Waldaue, the lands of Rig and Fluris, the lands of Myreside, with the links, coning-yairs, &c., the mill called Brandsmyth, the mill called West Barnes Mill, with the mill-lands of both, ten pounds of annual rent, to be taken out of the lands of Lochend, with all and sundrie lands and profits besides belonging to the keeping of the said castle.

Thus governed and endowed, Dunbar Castle twice received the unhappy Mary. After the death of Rizzio, she fled to this stronghold, where she was speedily joined by such a number of her friends as gave her a temporary ascendency over the actors in that cruel tragedy. Hither also she fled with her ill-chosen husband, Bothwell, when, nearly surprised, she made her escape from Borthwick Castle, in the disguise of a page, and, closely pursued by Lord Home, with difficulty found refuge within its walls. Here also she assembled, by proclamation, the unwilling and faint-hearted army by which she was deserted at Carberry-hill, when she was compelled to surrender herself prisoner, and was imprisoned in Lochleven Castle.

The place was, even after this event, for a short time defended by the Laird of Whitelaw, whom Bothwell had left in charge; but the garrison being in despair of obtaining relief, and the regent having, with his usual decisive celerity, brought cannon from Edinburgh to batter the place, Dunbar surrendered for the last time, was dismantled, and the artillery carried to Edinburgh.

The Earl of Moray and the Parliament now

resumed the policy of James IV.'s reign, and among particulars referred to the Lords of the Articles, they are required to consider what order shall be taken anent the manner of demolishing the Castle of Dunbar and the Inche, and to consider the 15th act of King James the Fourth, touching Dunbar. On the margin of the record is an imperfect note of the following purport:—"26th December, 1567. Ordains the Inche and Dunbar to be demolished and taken down, in respect of K. Jas----" There are obvious reasons why the regent held it more politic to carry on the demolition as if in execution of an ancient statute, than to take the odium of it on his own government. There can be no doubt that the castle was at this period completely destroyed, and that nothing, save the present vestiges, were left of its ancient strength.

In the year 1581, among a number of grants excepted by James VI. from the general Revocation of his Deeds of gift made through importunity, mention is made of the "forthe of Dunbar granted to William Boncle, burgess of Dunbar." This probably referred to the site of the fortress, and perhaps some grounds adjacent, allowed in gratuity to some citizen of the burgh.

TANTALLON CASTLE.

[TURNER AND THOMSON.]

The ruins of Tantallon, or Temptallon, according to the more ancient orthography, occupy a promontory which projects from the rocky coast of East-Lothian, and, hanging over the German Ocean just at the entrance of the Frith of Forth, forms a grand feature in the general picture as a vessel enters the estuary. The castle is situated about two miles from the little town of North Berwick, and commands a view of the wild and romantic rock called the Bass, which, till the time of the Revolution, was also the site of a fortress, strong in its insular situation and the inaccessible cliffs of the islet; long the hereditary castle of the ancient family of Lauder; then a crown fortress, and chiefly used as a state prison.

The ruins of Tantallon, though with little magnificence of architecture, have, from their extent, the strength of their original construction, and their striking situation, overhanging the billows of a wide and often troubled ocean, an imposing effect on the imagination. From the land side they are scarce visible, until the curious visitor, surmounting a height which conceals them, finds himself close under the external walls. This circumstance, which would render the castle an easy conquest since modern improvements in the art of war, took

nothing in ancient times from its supposed impregnability. When the besieger appeared in front of the only side of Tantallon which is not secured by the sea, he found opposed to him a strong curtain, flanked by towers of a massive construction, and had to pass two ditches, the inner of uncommon depth, ere he could approach the guarded entrance, while, in his attack, he lay fully exposed to the arrows and shot of the defenders.

In form, the fortress is an irregular hexagon, occupying the whole promontory with strong walls and high towers, and turrets designed to flank them; and in the interior is, as usual, a keep, or Gothic citadel, with many other buildings of great size and extent, and vaults beneath them for receiving provisions, and often, doubtless, for securing prisoners. The mind, when we enter the dilapidated court of this ancient and frowning ruin, is involuntarily carried back to the era of the mighty House of Douglas, so long the Lords of Tantallon, amidst whose numerous fortresses and houses of defence, this was the principal on the eastern border, while that of Hermitage, equally solitary and formidable, was, on the more western skirts of the island, their chief baronial castle; these were the extreme bulwarks of a power which extended from sea to sea, matched and bade defiance to the authority of sovereigns, and, but for a concurrence of circumstances which could scarce have been expected, threatened to place their owners on the throne of Scotland. Let it be remembered, however, in honour of this potent line, that if the pride and ambition of the Douglasses often fostered civil dis-

cord in their native country, their breasts were yet more frequently its barriers against foreign foes; that they repeatedly saved the crown, at which they sometimes appear to have aimed; and that, if we take into consideration both their high rank, and the distinguished military talents which seem to have been hereditary in the race, we will not deem an exaggeration the proud lines which they inscribed upon their swords, and which are still fondly quoted by local tradition:

> "Sae many sae good as of Douglas bluid hae been,
> In ae kinricke never yet were seen."

Tantallon, however, was not an early possession of this distinguished family. It is believed to have belonged in more ancient times to the Earls of Fife, the descendants of Macduff, and was certainly in the possession of Isabel, the last countess of that renowned line, and was comprehended in the settlement which she made of her honours and estates upon Robert Stuart, Earl of Menteith, whom she recognised by that deed as her lawful and nearest heir, in the year 1371. The castle, with his other domains, was forfeited to the crown in 1425, by Murdoch, Duke of Albany, son of the Earl Robert, and must have been soon afterwards bestowed by royal grant on the family of Douglas, which was then in the full pitch of its grandeur.

Many of the deeds and indentures of these too-powerful subjects are dated from these, their now ruinous towers of strength; and here barons, not inferior to them in rank or antiquity, subscribed bonds of man-rent, rendering themselves rather the

subjects than the allies of the Douglas.[1] There are also extant deeds, by which nobles who had offended them or their followers, bound themselves by way of atonement to enter the "iron grate" of their castles of Hermitage or Tantallon, upon the summons of their formidable owners.[2] When we remember that the one of these castles is embosomed amongst lonely hills and impassable morasses, and that the other is surrounded on one side by ramparts deemed impregnable, and on others by the raging ocean, we may conceive the predominant terror of the Douglases, which could induce nobles of high birth, and in all the pride of feudal independence, thus to place themselves within the absolute power of their offended foemen. It may be doubted whether the kings of Scotland themselves frequently received such marks of dependence and humility from their haughty nobles.

But at the eventful period, when the power of the great Earls of Douglas was actually placed in array against that of the crown, the better star of the Stuarts prevailed; and partly through the

[1] By a bond of man-rent, dated at Tantallon, 13th May, 1457, James, Lord Hamilton, became "Man of special service and retinue, for all the days of his life, to an high and mighty Lord, George Earl of Angus, Lord Douglas, &c." — See Godscroft, folio edit. p. 215.

[2] Robert Fleming of Cumbernauld, ancestor of the Lords Fleming, on 24th September, 1444, entered into bond to James Earl of Angus, Lord of Liddesdale and Jedward Forest, engaging to enter within the iron grate of the Castle of Tantallon or Hermitage, upon eight days' warning under a penalty of 2000 merks. The offence given was his burning the Earl's corn within the barony of North Berwick, and taking away his cattle on Fastern's-Even.—Godscroft, p. 210.

wisdom of James the Second's chief counsellor, Kennedy, Archbishop of Saint Andrews, partly that the coronet of Douglas was for once placed on a head of inferior capacity, the family was totally broken, ruined, and exiled.

Tantallon, however, amid the general confiscation of the domains of the ancient Earls of Douglas, passed, with the castle and lordship of Douglas itself, from the elder branch, but not from the family. George Douglas, fifth Earl of Angus, had, as is well known, adhered to the royal family in the hard strife betwixt them and the power of the crown, which he had aided against his kinsman, the last earl of the elder line, with such activity and zeal, that he contributed much to the success of the royal party, and gave occasion to the popular saying, that the Red Douglas (such being the complexion of Angus) had put down the Black. His services were rewarded with such ample grants of his kinsman's forfeited domains, that the power of the earl and his successors became as awful to the subject, and nearly as formidable to the crown, as the ancient line had formerly been. Tantallon and Hermitage belonged to the Earls of Angus, as they had formerly done to those of Douglas; and although James IV. compelled the earl, called Bell-the-Cat, to exchange the former for that of Bothwell in Clydesdale, yet the latter continued to be the principal fortress of the family, until the beginning of the eighteenth century.

In 1528, the same act of Parliament which appoints the royal castles of Edinburgh and Dunbar to be put in a state of defence, strongly recommends

to the subjects who had defensible castles on the sea-coast, to fortify them against the expected approach of the English invaders; and Tantallon is distinguished amongst others.

The house of Angus was destined to experience reverses, as well as their predecessors of the direct line of Douglas. They had risen nearly as high, but their fall was neither so calamitous nor so irretrievable. In the minority of James V., the head of that family, partly by his marriage with Margaret of England, the Queen-Mother, had climbed to a mighty pitch of power, and abused it by keeping the person of the king in a sort of durance, and obstructing the course of justice wherever it affected any of his personal followers. "There durst none strive with a Douglas," says Pitscottie, "nor yet with a Douglas's man; for if he did, he was sure to get the worse." When James V., therefore, escaping from the thraldom in which Angus restrained him, fled to Stirling, summoned the nobility of the north around him, and banished the Douglases from his presence and councils, he was so readily supported by the bulk of the kingdom, that he was soon at the head of a numerous army, with which he proceeded to expel the obnoxious earl from his kingdom.

Angus for a time stood his ground, victualled and fortified his Castle of Tantallon, and placed there as governor Simon Panango, who, from his name, was probably a foreigner. He did not, however, shut himself up within its walls; but having ever in his mouth, says Hume of Godscroft, the maxim of his forefathers, that it was better to

hear the lark sing than the mouse *cheep*, he kept the field, and fixed his headquarters at Billie, near Coldingham, with a considerable force of horsemen.

The King, in the meantime, advanced to the siege of Tantallon, and heavy ordnance were transported from Dunbar to reduce the fortress. Pitscottie, with laudable minuteness, informs us that two of the guns were called Thrawn-mouthed Meg and her Marrow. There were also considerable efforts employed to subdue the place, and lives were lost and damage received on both sides. But thrawn-mouthed Meg and her marrow did not make the expected impression on the walls of Tantallon, and there was considerable loss sustained by an accidental explosion of the ammunition destined to serve them. Simon Panango showed both skill and manhood; and the besiegers, straitened by the operations of Angus and his cavalry, were obliged at last to retreat with little credit. The horsemen of Angus attacked the rear of the royal army, did considerable damage, took some of the guns, and slew David Falconer, who had the charge of the royal artillery; at which the young king felt so much displeasure, that he is said to have vowed that no Douglas should in his lifetime be ever permitted to reside in Scotland.

The Earl of Argyle was next sent against Angus, but he was defeated near the pass called the *Peaths*, or *Pease*, where, as Cromwell afterwards said, "One man may do more to hinder than ten to make way." Godscroft has preserved a rude rhyme, by which the Borderers ridiculed

the rude appointments of the cavalry who attended the northern Earl.

> "The Earl of Argyle he was bowne him to ride,
> From the borders of Edgebuckling brae,
> With all his habergeons by his side,
> Ilk man upon a sonke of strae."

But after this transient success, the royal forces advancing in great strength, Angus was compelled to fly to England. The Castle of Tantallon was then surrendered, as Pitscottie intimates, by the submission of Stephen Panango, the captain, which is most probable, although Godscroft would insinuate that it was yielded in consequence of the Earl of Angus's orders, upon a secret understanding that he was to preserve his estate and honours. Of this there is no evidence, excepting the authority of the somewhat partial historian of the house of Douglas. It is certain that the Earl of Angus was attainted in 1528, and Tantallon, and all his other castles and estates, were forfeited to the Crown.

These events caused the strength of Tantallon to pass into a proverb, and indeed into a sort of song, of which the words preserved are

> "Ding down Tantallon,
> Make a brigg to the Bass."

These two lines, recording the two attempts as equally impossible, were sung to the military air which formed the old Scotch reveillee.

James V. during his lifetime, retained the most implacable resentment to Angus, but after that monarch's death, the earl obtained permission to

return to Scotland, and was admitted to plead in Parliament for a revocation of his forfeiture. One alleged reason for revoking the attainder was, that whereas an alleged ground had been the " stuffing of his castles of Newark and Tantallon against the king," the doom of forfeiture did not state precisely by what agents, or on what occasion, this act of disloyalty was committed. The earl was favourably heard, and his restoration took place in 1567.

But Angus was impoverished by his long exile, and though restored to the possession of his castles and manors, he was unable, it would seem, to restore the interior of Tantallon to its original grandeur, or render it habitable as a mansion, though it remained defensible as a castle. This we learn from Sir Ralph Sadler, who had been despatched by Henry VIII. to negotiate the proposed match betwixt Prince Edward, afterwards Edward the VIth, and the infant Queen of Scotland. The impolitic violence and haughtiness of Henry, threatening when he ought to have soothed, had moved to such a pitch the equally proud spirit of the Scottish nation, that the safety of his ambassador, Sadler, became problematical; and the Earl of Angus, bound to the English king by protection and benefits received during his exile, found himself obliged to grant the envoy an escort to conduct him in safety from Edinburgh, and shelter him in the Castle of Tantallon. Sadler, from the dilapidated condition of the castle in point of accommodation, seems to have considered it as a miserable place of refuge, and expresses himself with that regard to his personal comforts, which

has in all ages characterised the English so much more than their northern neighbours. " I could perceive," said the envoy of the privy council, " the Earl of Angus had no great good will to let me be in his house of Temptallon, because the same is unfurnished, and almost all the lodgings taken down to be new builded." And again, that the earl had promised that the house should be made ready for him. " But I sent a servant of mine," says Sadler, " who brought me word that the house was cleanly unfurnished both of bedding and all manner of household stuff, and none to be bought or hired, nor no manner of provision to be made thereof, nor any kind of victual nearer than this town, which is twenty miles off." He dates a subsequent letter from Temptallon, " where," said he, " though it be but easily furnished, and slender lodging in it, yet, I assure you, it is of such strength, as I must not fear the malice of mine enemies, and therefore do now think myself to be out of danger." Sir Ralph Sadler appears to have remained at Tantallon, nursing an expiring negotiation, from the 6th November to beginning of December, 1543. Sir Ralph Sadler's State Papers, vol. i., p. 319, *et sequen.*

During the subsequent regency, the Dowager Queen Regent, Mary of Guise, became desirous of putting a French garrison into Tantallon, as she had into Dunbar and Inchkeith, in order the better to bridle the lords and barons who inclined to the reformed faith, and to secure by citadels the sea-coast of the Frith of Forth. For this purpose the regent, to use the phrase of the time, " dealed with "

the Earl of Angus for his consent to the proposed measure. He occupied himself, while she was speaking, in feeding a falcon which sat upon his wrist, and only replied by addressing the bird, but leaving the Queen to make the application, " The devil is in this greedy gled—she will never be fou." But when the Queen, without appearing to notice this hint, continued to press her obnoxious request, Angus replied, in the true spirit of a feudal noble, " Yea, madam, the castle is yours ; God forbid else. But by the might of God, madam ! " such was his usual oath, " I must be your captain and keeper for you, and I will keep it as well as any you can place there."

This nobleman, whose life had been spent in continued action, and who makes an important figure in the chronicles of his time, died at Tantallon about 1556 or 1557.

No other facts of consequence appear respecting Tantallon, until the middle of the seventeenth century, by which time the Douglasses of the house of Angus, though elevated to the Marquisate of Douglas, seem to have been depressed in circumstances, as many debts are about that period found affecting their East-Lothian domains.

Tantallon, like other fortresses of Scotland, was garrisoned by the Covenanters against the king in 1639, in despite, it may be presumed, of the inclination of its owner, the Marquis of Douglas.

Finally, it was defended against Oliver Cromwell, and taken after a short siege, the disadvantage of the rising ground in front being found fatal to the defenders.

About the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Marquis, afterwards Duke of Douglas, sold the estate of North Berwick, with the castle of Tantallon, to Sir Hugh Dalrymple, president of the Court of Session, who had been one of his guardians. The castle, which till that period had continued in a habitable condition, was then dismantled entirely, and left to decay; while the lapse of a century, in a situation so much exposed, as well as the depredations of those who carried off stones from the ruins for rural purposes, have reduced the remains to their present condition.

In the vaults of the castle was found a seal, bearing the arms of the Douglas family, rudely carved, which is now in the possession of Sir Hew Hamilton Dalrymple, Bart. of North Berwick, the present proprietor of the castle, and the representative of the president, by whom it was acquired.

THE BASS ROCK.

[TURNER.]

THE Bass is an island, or rather a tremendous rock, about 800 feet in height, starting out of the sea, just opposite to the formidable castle of Tantallon, upon the shore of East Lothian. It is about a mile in circumference, and is conical on the one

side, presenting on the other an abrupt and overhanging precipice. It may be well termed—

——— "An island salt and bare,
The haunt of seals and orcs and sea-mews' clang."

Upon the top of the rock gushes out a spring of clear water, and there is verdure enough to support a few sheep. But its chief inhabitants are sea-fowl, in such immense quantities, that they literally darken the air when the discharge of a gun puts them on the wing. They are of all sizes that swim the sea, and scream in all variety of notes. To visit the place at sunrise, when all the feathered tribes are preparing to take wing, gives one of the most extraordinary sights which Scotland affords.

On this rock, in the midst of a tempestuous ocean, and hardly accessible to boats, save at one precarious and hazardous passage, one would scarce have expected to find habitation, save for the sea-fowl which we have noticed But in barbarous times, a sense of safety supersedes all considerations of comfort or convenience, and the island was long the chosen stronghold of the Lauders, originally of that ilk, and afterwards called Lauders of the Bass.

In the time of Mary of Guise's regency, Beague thus describes the castle of the Bass, which, by the way, he terms the Isle of Goose, according to the ancient French custom of new-christening or mutilating the names of the places they have occasion to mention:—

"Now, the island in which the castle stands is itself an

impregnable rock, of a small extent and oval figure, cut out by the hands of nature; it has only one avenue that leads to it, and that is towards the castle, but so very difficult and uneasy, that by reason of the hidden sands that surround the rock, nothing can approach it but one little boat at a time. The island is so exorbitantly uneven, that till one reach the wall of the castle, he cannot have sure footing in any one place; so that [as I have often observed] those that enter it must climb up by the help of a strong cable thrown down for the purpose; and when they have got with much ado to the foot of the wall, they sit down in a wide basket, and in this posture are mounted up by strength of hands. There is no getting into this wonderful fortress by any other means. Formerly, it had a postern-gate which facilitated the entry, but it is now thrown down, and fortified in such a manner as is incredible."

Beague gives a farther account of the castle being summoned by an English officer, who approached it in a boat, and offered the governor 4000 nobles, and to each private soldier 300, providing they would yield up the castle. The governor returned an answer of defiance. The French author also says, that the garrison consisted of 120 men. If that was the case, it must have been garrisoned by the crown, with consent of the owner. The French officer has also the credulity to believe that so many men were in a considerable degree subsisted on the fish brought to the island by the solan-geese, and that they had no other firing during the whole year than the sticks with which the sea-fowl build their nests.

It is said that the Kings of Scotland, valuing its strength and position, were very desirous to acquire this fortress, and that one of the Stuart dynasty, when Lauder, succeeding as heir to his father, resigned into the royal hands the island of the Bass,

in order to receive new infeofment, addressed him thus: "You draw little income from this barren rock: let it remain in my hands, and ask from me the best barony at the crown's disposal in the stead of the Bass." Lauder hesitated, looked hither and thither, but ended with shrugging up his shoulders, and replying, "In troth your Grace maun just give me the auld craig back again." In the wars between Mary and her son, the Regent Murray is represented, or misrepresented, by Lethington, as extremely desirous to strengthen his party by the possession of the Bass.

But the island, so much envied, was not acquired by the crown until 1671, when the Lauder family sold it to Charles II., by whom it was converted into a royal fortress and state-prison.

The castle, situated on the south side of the island, is now ruinous. From the Views of Slezer,[1] it seems to have consisted of a curtain, with four square towers, or bastions, well mounted with cannon, and having within its enclosures the necessary barracks. A lower battery of three guns, commanded the landing-place, which, indeed, was scarcely entitled to the name, for there was properly no landing-place, as both boat and men were hoisted up within into the higher part of the fortress, by means of a machine resembling a crane. On the

[1] [Captain John Slezer's "Theatrum Scotiæ; containing the prospects of their Majesty's castles and palaces, together with those of the most considerable towns and colleges; the ruins of many ancient abbeys, churches, monasteries, and convents. within the said kingdom; all curiously engraven on copperplates, with a short description of each place." London, 1693, folio; Edin. 1814, folio.]

very summit of the rock was a small tower for an out-look, on which the flag was displayed.

This dreary, desolate, and probably unhealthy island, was the usual state-prison for those accused of high treason, or who were guilty of opposing the arbitrary measures adopted in Scotland in the reigns of Charles II. and James II. The celebrated John Blackadder, a covenanting divine of great eminence, was long prisoner in the Bass, and died there of a complaint caught from the dampness of the situation. Here, too, the no less celebrated Alexander Peden poured forth at least two of his prophetic effusions. On one occasion, a girl of fourteen years old came to his chamber-door, and mocked him, as she heard him in earnest prayer. "Poor thing," answered the covenanter, "thou dost mock at the worship of God; but ere long a strange and surprising judgment shall stay thy mirth." Shortly after, as the unlucky maiden walked along the verge of the rock, a sudden blast of wind swept her into the sea, where she perished. The other anecdote was of a less severe character. The imprisoned divine heard one of the soldiers swear at him as he passed, and replied mildly, "Poor man, thou knowest not what thou sayest, but thou shalt repent of it." The soldier was struck with remorse, even as he heard the words, and went to the main guard in horrors of conscience. On being ordered to his arms, he refused, saying he had borne them too long against Christ, his cause, and his people. The governor, finding the man deaf to reasoning and threats, considered him probably as insane, and sent him ashore out of the

garrison. Having a wife and children, he took a house in East-Lothian, and became a singular Christian. This, which is recorded by Patrick Walker as a miracle, will probably be now regarded as a remarkable instance of the force of imagination, working, no doubt, in this case, to the spiritual welfare of the patient.

The Revolution found the Bass governed by about fifty men, under the command of Captain Maitland, who held it out for King James, but at length was compelled to surrender it to the new government, who placed Fletcher of Salton in command of the place. But there were three officers of King James confined in the fortress, who, contriving to draw over part of the garrison to their opinions, rose on the others, and possessed themselves of the place in name of the exiled monarch. Having received some assistance of arms and provisions from France, they took several vessels with their armed row-boats, and greatly incommoded the navigation of the Frith. Two men of war, carrying fifty and sixty guns, were sent to reduce the place; but after two days' constant firing on both sides, the ships did so little damage and received so much, that the vessels, much shattered, were sent to Leith for repairs, and smaller ships employed to cruize off the island and convert the siege into a blockade.

The garrison soon became much straitened for provisions; and to deter any one from assisting them, a gentleman named Trotter, who was condemned to death for having afforded them some supplies, was ordered for execution on the mainland

opposite to the island. But when he was brought to the gallows, which had been erected at the little village of Castletown, a cannon was fired from the Bass among the crowd, which occasioned such a panic that they fled in all directions. The condemned man was removed to a gibbet erected at a safer distance, and there suffered in terms of his sentence.

At length, the garrison having lost their boat, and being reduced to the last straits for want of provisions, were compelled to make proposals for capitulation, and two of the Scottish Privy Council were sent to receive their terms. The governor received these deputies honourably, treated them with French wine and other delicacies, in order to exclude the idea of the real distress for provisions; and when they rowed off, caused all the hats and cloaks he could collect to be disposed on pikes and muskets along the walls, so as to intimate that the place was full of men. Impressed with what they had seen, the deputies reported to the Privy Council that the Bass was well provided, and recommended their granting favourable terms, which were as follows: 1. The garrison were to retain their swords, such as pleased were to be transported to France, and the rest were to have permission to remain at home unmolested. 2. They were permitted to dispose of all that belonged to them in the garrison, together with their boats and private property, to the best advantage. 3. It was stipulated that such of the garrison as were to go abroad, should remain unmolested at Edinburgh, with some allowance for subsistence, until means of transpor-

tation should be procured. 4. The benefit of the capitulation was extended to all soldiers of the garrison not at present in the island, and to all accused of aiding and assisting them, who might claim the benefit of the treaty.

Upon these honourable terms, the last strength in Britain which displayed the flag of James II. was surrendered to King William. The castle was demolished, and the island was soon after bestowed by the crown on Sir James Dalrymple, Lord President of the Court of Session, who was possessed of the Barony of North Berwick and Castle of Tantallon, on the neighbouring mainland. The Bass is now the property of his lordship's descendant, Sir Hew Dalrymple Hamilton, of Bargany and North Berwick. The greatest delicacy which the rock produces is the solan-goose, remarkable for its maintaining exactly the same price in the Edinburgh market which it did one hundred years ago, namely, two shillings and fourpence. It would be highly censurable, in the present day, to omit the mention of any circumstance connected with *gastronomie;* but being ourselves by no means connoisseurs on such subjects, we will content ourselves with stating the opinion of Daniel de Foe.

"They [solan-geese] feed on the herrings, and therefore 'tis observed they come just before, or with them, and go away with them also; though 'tis evident they do not follow them, but go all away to the north, whither none knows but themselves, and he that guides them. As they live on fish, so they eat like fish, which, together with their being so exceeding fat, makes them, in my opinion, a very coarse dish, rank, and ill relished, and soon gorging the stomach. But as they are looked upon there as a dainty, I have no more to say; all countries have their several gusts and particular palates.

Onions and garlick were dainties, it seems, in Egypt, and horse-flesh is so to this day in Tartary, and much more may a solan-goose be so in other places.

"It is a large fowl, rather bigger than an ordinary goose; 'tis duck-footed, and swims as a goose; but the bill is long, thick, and pointed like a crane or heron, only the neck much thicker, and not above five inches long. Their laying but one egg, which sticks to the rock, and will not fall off, unless pulled off by force, and then not to be stuck on again, though we thought them fictions, yet, being there at the season, we found true; as also their hatching by holding the egg fast in their foot. What Nature meant by giving these singularities to a creature, that has nothing else in it worth notice, we cannot determine."[1]

FAST-CASTLE.

[THOMSON.]

THESE remarkable ruins do not fall, properly speaking, within the bounds of the Lothians. But they are objects of considerable interest, and, we believe, have not hitherto been engraved. They are the remains of a gloomy border fortress, situated near to Saint Abb's Head, on the iron-girdled shores of the German Ocean. Imagination can scarce form a scene more striking, yet more appalling, than this rugged and ruinous stronghold, situated on an abrupt and inaccessible precipice, overhanging the raging ocean, and tenanted of

[1] Description of Scotland, p. 21, in Tour through Great Britain, vol. iii.

yore by men stormy and gloomy as the tempests they looked down upon. Viewed from the sea, Fast-Castle is more like the nest of some gigantic roc or condor, than a dwelling for human creatures, being so completely allied in colour and rugged appearance with the huge cliffs, amongst which it seems to be jammed, that it is difficult to discover what is rock and what is building. To the land side, the only access is by a rocky path of a very few feet wide, bordered on either hand by a tremendous precipice. This leads to the castle, a donjon tower of moderate size, surrounded by flanking walls, as usual, which, rising without interval and abruptly from the verge of the precipice, must, in ancient times, have rendered the place nearly impregnable.

Fast-Castle was in former days a place of retreat of the great Earls of Home, which they used on particular occasions, when safety and privacy were at once desirable. Notwithstanding its strength, it was repeatedly taken and recaptured during the Border wars. In the period following the battle of Homildown, it fell into the hands of the English, and was garrisoned by troops under the command of one Thomas Holden, who harassed the neighbouring counties of the Merse and Lothian by perpetual excursions. But in 1460 it was recovered to the Scottish allegiance, being surprised (*tam subtiliter quam viriliter*, says Bower) by Patrick Dunbar, a younger son of the Earl of March.

After the disastrous defeat of Pinkie, in 1547, Fast-Castle had the lot of other fortresses on the Scottish border, and again fell into the power of

the English, and was recovered in the following gallant manner, in 1548:—

"Not long after, when the captain of Fast-Castle had commanded the husbandmen adjoining to bring thither [at a certain day] great store of victuals. The young men thereabouts having that occasion, assembled thither at the day appointed, who taking their burdens from the horses, and laying them on their shoulders, were received [after they had passed the bridge, which was made over two high rocks] into the castle, where [laying down that which they brought] they suddenly [by a sign given] set upon the keepers of the gates, slew them, and [before the other Englishmen could be assembled] possessed the other places, weapons, and artillery of the castle, and then receiving the rest of their company into the same [through the same great and open gate], they wholly kept and enjoyed the castle for their countrymen."—*Holinshed*, vol. v., p. 561. Edit. 1808.

In 1570, when the Earl of Sussex marched into Scotland to punish the Borderers who had harboured Westmoreland, and other northern rebels of the 12th of Queen Elizabeth, the Earl of Home's principal fortress of Home Castle having been taken, Drury, marshal of Berwick, was sent to invest Fast-Castle with two thousand men. There were only about ten Scots in the fort, who, on seeing themselves attacked by so great a force, surrendered the place on the first summons. Yet Drury was content to garrison it with ten or twelve Englishmen only, "which were thought able and number sufficient enough to keep it against all the power of Scotland, the situation thereof is so strong."[1]

In the reign of James VI. of Scotland, Fast-Castle became the appropriate stronghold of on

[1] Holinshed, vol. iv., p. 243.

of the darkest characters of that dark age, the celebrated Logan of Restalrig. By what means this personage obtained a place of refuge so fitted to his character and condition, we are ignorant, and only know that property changed owners frequently in that period of headlong revolutions and proscriptions. Logan was ambitious, expensive, avaricious, at once unlimited in his wishes, and unscrupulous of the means he adopted for their gratification.

There is a contract existing in the charter-chest of Lord Napier, betwixt Logan and a very opposite character, the celebrated inventor of the logarithms, the terms of which are extremely singular. The paper, which is in the possession of Lord Napier, is dated July 1594, and sets forth,—

"Forasmuch as there were old reports and appearance, that a sum of money was hid within John Logan's house of Fast-Castle, John Napier should do his utmost diligence to search and seek out, and by all craft and ingine to find out the same, and by the grace of God shall either find out the same, or make it sure that no such thing has been there."

For his reward he was to have the exact third of what was found, and to be safely guarded by Logan back to Edinburgh with the same. And in case he should find nothing, after all trial and diligence taken, he refers the satisfaction of his travel and pains to the discretion of Logan.

The fate of this investigation is unknown. The contract evinces much credulity on the part of the great Napier; but the bounds of knowledge were then so indistinctly fixed, that there lay a waste of *terra incognita* between physical science and mystical doctrines, in which the wisest philosophers

often are found to have bewildered themselves. As for Logan, he probably soon discovered that he could win his way to wealth better through the assistance of ambitious men than of astral or earthly spirits. He was a friend of the turbulent Francis Stewart, Earl of Bothwell,[1] and made his boast that he could maintain him within his house of Fast-Castle, let king and council say what they would. But his grand effort for attaining wealth was his connexion with the Gowrie Conspiracy, an event so strangely incredible on all sides, that it is difficult to form a consistent opinion on the subject. Still, notwithstanding all that ingenuity has urged against the reality of the conspiracy, and much doubtless may be urged from the incongruity of the evidence, the opinion of Dr Robertson seems distinctly to preponderate.

The historian states it to have been the purpose of the Earl of Gowrie and his brother to have made themselves masters of the king's person, forced him into a boat, which might have been easily brought up the Tay to the bottom of the garden of Gowrie House, and thus conducted him by sea to Logan's stronghold on the shores of Berwickshire, there to remain at the disposal of the conspirators, or it may be at that of Queen Elizabeth. This was no doubt a very wicked and very wild scheme; but it was quite consistent with the practices of the time, and with the character of the powerful Scottish barons, who were wont to seize upon the person of the king as the briefest mode of changing an administration. Such enterprises were repeatedly undertaken by the Earl of Bothwell, and a similar purpose had

[1] [See Note, *ante*, p. 287.]

been to a certain degree accomplished by what was called the Raid of Ruthven, in which the father of the Earl of Gowrie had been concerned, and for which he suffered death. When we consider that the unhappy brethren may have been blinded by ambition and revenge to the dangers of the enterprise, and reflect that, strangely as it was planned, it had wellnigh succeeded, we may indeed wonder at their conduct, but ought not to consider it as altogether incredible.

On the other hand, to suppose that James got up a supposititious plot, to have an opportunity of murdering the Ruthvens, is totally inconsistent with the king's well-known character. James, whatever failings he had, was a man of a lenient disposition; but had he been otherwise, he was by no means a man likely to put his person into bodily peril, in order to obtain by doing so an ostensible cause for satiating his revenge. Construe the account how we will, it is evident that a violent and doubtful skirmish was to be the prelude to the slaughter of the Ruthvens; and can it be supposed that James was a person who would risk his life on the issue? He could not hope to murder the Earl of Gowrie in a town of which he was the provost, and in a castle where he was surrounded by retainers, without such a scuffle as actually took place; and having, as a king, many other modes of gratifying his resentment against the Ruthvens, (though there is no proof he entertained such a feeling,) we cannot, on a general view of the subject, consider any hypothesis as

probable which throws upon him the blame of the slaughter.

Nine years after the event, Logan being then dead, his part in the Gowrie conspiracy became known by a correspondence betwixt him and the unfortunate Earl, previous to the attempt. These letters were strangely discovered in the possession of one Sprott, a notary-public. Logan had intrusted them to the custody of one John Bour, a friend of Sprott, but who was dead when they were discovered. One of them was of Gowrie's writing, five others in that of Logan. These dangerous letters were stolen from Bour by Sprott, who, for his own misfortune, kept them rather as a curiosity, it would seem, than for any other purpose. They go every length necessary to confirm Robertson's theory, and show that the purpose was to imprison the king at Fast-Castle. Logan boasts repeatedly how well his house is situated for the purpose, directs the Earl of Gowrie to come by sea, and make a private signal when opposite Fast-Castle, and declares his determination to stand by him at all hazards, and, like a daring old ruffian as he was, he seasons all these dark proposals with "*hæc jocose.*"[1] In a subsequent letter, the nature of the

[1] "My Lord, you may easily understand that such a purpose as your lordship intendeth cannot be done rashly, but with deliberation. And I think for myself that it were most meet to have the men your lordship spake of ready in a boat or bark, and address them as if they were taking pastime on the sea, in such fair summer-time. And if your lordship could think good, either yourself to come to my house of Fast-Castle by sea, or to send your brother, I should have the

proposed conspiracy is more plainly indicated.[1] He again recommends Fast Castle as the scene

place very quiet and well provided, after your lordship's advertisement, where we should have no scant of the best venison can be had in England. And no others should have access to haunt the place during your lordship's being here, but all things very quiet. And if your lordship doubt of safe landing, I shall provide all such necessaries as may serve for your lordship's arrival within a flight-shot of the house; and persuade your lordship you shall be as sure and quiet here, while we have settled our plot, as if you were in your own chamber: for I trust, and am assured, we shall hear word within a few days from them your lordship knoweth of; [*this passage probably refers to some communication with England by sea;*] for I have care to see what ships come home by. Your lordship knoweth I have kept the Lord Bothwell quietly in this house in his greatest extremity, say both king and council what they liked. I hope, if all things come to pass, as I trust they shall, to have both your lordship and his lordship at one good dinner before I die. *Hæc jocose*, to animate your lordship: I doubt not, my lord, but all things shall be well. And I am resolved whereof your lordship shall not doubt of any thing on my part, yea, to peril life, land, honour and goods; yea, the hazard of hell shall not affray me from that, yea, although the scaffold were already set up. The sooner the matter were done it were the better; for the king's buck-hunting will be shortly, and I hope it shall prepare some dainty cheer for us to dine against the next year."

[1] At the risk of lengthening the article, we cannot help quoting this remarkable passage: "I think all matters shall be concluded at my house of Fast-Castle; for I and Mr Alexander Ruthven concluded, that ye should come with him and his lordship, and only another man with you, being but only four in company, intil one of the great fishing-boats by sea to my house, where ye shall land as safely as on Leith shore; and the house against your lordship's coming to be quiet; and when you are about half a mile from shore, as it were passing by the house, to gar set forth a waff. But for God's sake let neither any knowledge come to my lord, my brother's ears, nor yet to Mr W. R., my lord's old pedagogue; for my brother is kittle to shoe behind, and dare not

where all should be concluded—recommends that the two brothers, with only another man, should bring *him* (the king, doubtless) by sea to Fast-Castle, and show a signal. He cautions Gowrie against betraying him to his (Logan's) brother, or Mr William Rhind, lest the one should object motives of policy, or the other reasons of religion, "which," says Logan, "I cannot abide." Lastly, he stirs up the Ruthvens to obtain a contented revenge for the death of Greysteil, meaning the Earl of Gowrie, their father, who, from his personal strength and deeds of chivalry, had obtained that epithet. This remarkable passage, unless we hold the whole correspondence a forgery is decisive proof of the reality of the Gowrie Conspiracy, and its general purport, although it may be doubtful whether the king's death or captivity was ultimately intended. Perhaps that was a point left to be settled afterwards, as ambition or revenge should dictate.

Logan's letters are dated from Gun's Green, a place near Fast-Castle, where he had a house, the fortress itself being reserved for extraordinary occasions.

Sprott's confession contained some farther pieces of evidence. He had screwed himself into the partial confidence of Laird Bour, and had caught up many expressions which tallied with the letters.

enterprise for fear, and the other will dissuade us from our purpose with reasons of religion, which I can never abide. I think there is none of a noble heart, or carries a stomach worth a penny, but they would be content and glad to see a contented revenge of Greysteil's death."

The fair barony of Dirleton was, it seems, to be the stipulated reward of Logan's services. His confidant, Bour, alluded to this in his intercourse with Sprott, while the correspondence was going on, and hinted to him that Logan would obtain Dirleton without gold or silver, but that he would buy it dearly notwithstanding; and on another occasion, that he feared the Laird would in short time be either landless or lifeless.

The government proceeded with such severity against Sprott, as if they meant that his blood should seal his evidence. His silence, after the conspiracy had been defeated by Gowrie's death, could not injure the King's safety, and was certainly a weakness rather than a crime. Yet he was tried, condemned, and executed for misprision of treason, and died strongly avouching on the scaffold all the circumstances of his confession. "Shame to myself," he said, "shame to the devil—but all glory to Almighty God!" and proceeded to lay the blame of his crime towards the King upon his haunting the company of Restalrig, who was a man void of religion, and stained with many other vices, and of his confederate and emissary, Bour, who likewise was irreligious and without the fear of God. This familiarity, he said, led him to pry into their guilty secrets, which otherwise not knowing, he could not have been guilty of concealing. He concluded by assuring the persons, ministers, and others, who were present, that he would give a sign, after he was thrown from the gallows, that he adhered to his confession. It is said that,

accordingly, he lifted up his hands, and clapped them three times while yet in the death struggle.

The punishment of Sprott appears cruel; that of Logan, who was tried and condemned for high treason after death, his bones for that purpose being brought into court, was at once horrible and absurd. Such extravagant proceedings always weaken the cause they are designed to support, by giving men reason to suspect the motives of extravagant severity. The execution of Sprott was said to be resolved on in order to conceal the forgery of the letters, and the conviction of Logan after death was alleged to have been obtained for the purpose of bestowing his estate of Restalrig upon the Earl of Murray. Neither of these deductions are correct. The late acute and ingenious Malcolm Laing examined the letters with the utmost care, and though strongly prejudiced against their authenticity when he commenced his task, ended by considering them as amply established. And from the Records of the transmission of property in the Register House of Edinburgh, it appears that Robert Logan was divested of his estate of Restalrig, near Edinburgh, long before his death, so that there could be no room for a claim of forfeiture, nine years after that event, to place it in the king's hands. James, who was vexed and disturbed by the incredulity with which some of the clergy and others heard his narrative of the Gowrie Conspiracy, was probably disposed to make the most which was possible of this additional evidence, and by the extreme proceedings in the case, rather hurt than benefited his own cause.

Such are the mysterious and guilty remembrances which hang round the frowning ruins of this ancient strength. Fast-Castle now belongs to a gentleman, distinguished for the zeal with which he has both patronised and prosecuted geological science, Sir James Hall of Dunglas, Bart.[1]

[1] [The Baronet died in June 1832.]

END OF VOLUME SEVENTH.

PR
5301
E34
v.7

Scott, (Sir) Walter
Miscellaneous prose
works

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

NOT WANTED IN RUSH